

Bomb Texas

Willem Oltmans

bron

Willem Oltmans, *Bomb Texas*. Papieren Tijger, Breda 2003

Zie voor verantwoording: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/oltm003bomb01_01/colofon.php

Let op: boeken en tijdschriftjaargangen die korter dan 140 jaar geleden verschenen zijn, kunnen auteursrechtelijk beschermd zijn. Welke vormen van gebruik zijn toegestaan voor dit werk of delen ervan, lees je in de [gebruiksvoorwaarden](#).



09-11

Americans are collectively suffering from an acute case of shell shock following the events of September 2001. On that day, four planeloads of unsuspecting passengers went down in the worst act of terrorism ever experienced in the history of the United-States. Some three thousand people died on the ground as result of that cold-blooded act of barbarity. Ever since, Americans have felt very sorry for themselves.

Most of the rest of the world and especially the Europeans joined the United-States in its grief and anger.

Russia alone lost an estimated twenty million citizens during World War II. All of Europe experienced two world wars. Those of us, who lived through similar tragedies, deeply sympathize with the victims of 09-11 in America. But what we refused to do, is to join in Yankee whining and complaining that their fate and suffering has been much worse and more painful than anyone else's could ever have been.

During World War II, one hundred German cities were wiped of the face of the earth. Not two towers, like in Manhattan in 2001. Entire city centers were carpet bombed out of existence by long years of sustained terrorism during allied bombing raids on innocent civilians. For instance: on July 27, 1943, large sections of Hamburg were completely destroyed by RAF and US Eighth Army Air Force bombers in Operation Gomorrah. Hell broke loose at 01:00 a.m. when American and British planes began dropping ten thousand tons of high explosives and incendiary bombs on civilian housing in residential suburbs like Hammerbrook, Hamm-Nord, Hamm-Sud, Bilwelder Ausschlag, St. Georg, Eil-nek, Bambek and Wansbek. They were all reduced to ashes in 24 hours. A firestorm broke out which rose 2.000 meters into the sky. It consumed oxygen to such a formidable extent that air currents reached hurricane force. It lasted many hours and burned everything in its path. The next day smoke from the city rose 8.000 meters into the sky. No-one knew how many people had perished. This allied bombing raid alone produced a tidal wave of more than one million refugees. That is why the Germans, and other Europeans, will think twice before agreeing to bomb Iraq, or any other country.

09-11 caused a mass slaughter not experienced by the Americans since the Civil War in the mid nineteenth century, when the north and south were locked in a bloodletting struggle for domination. Hence, in 2001, an act of war hit the US for the first time in two hundred years. A stimulus response sequence occurred. This is unlearned and common to all species. It is relatively unmodifiable by motivational factors. Most American minds instantly produced the classic reflex, which occurs as a mechanical act and that lacks volition or choice. It is usually accompanied by primitive thoughtlessness. It also shows unreasonable impulsiveness. Such was the reaction of George Bush and a majority of Americans to 09-11. The president instantly declared a war on terrorism without any investigation or composed reflection beforehand. He presented the public with a fait accompli that was based on a blatant lie. He pronounced a

guilty verdict for the crime without possessing or offering the slightest proof. Being the brainless amateur he is, he maneuvered himself into a position which left him no room for reality once additional facts and more information became available.

Bush immediately chose as the murderous culprit of this hideous 09-11 crime, Osama bin Laden, a former US ally in the erstwhile battle against Soviet imperialism in Afghanistan. In the Bush family it is not uncommon for one-time staunch allies being turned into unrelenting enemies. With 36.000 soldiers armed to the teeth father Bush invaded Panama in December 1989 ordering them to kidnap a former partner, the head of state, Manuel Noriega. Bush senior had him locked up in an under-ground Florida jail, never to be heard of again. The world remained silent watching the elder Bush behave like a pirate king. Once again, America, at the discretion of the White House, unilaterally extended the limits of politically and diplomatically acceptable behavior in world affairs. Junior Bush seems hell-bent on outdoing his father when it comes to matters of unlawful conduct in foreign affairs. He entered the White House as an illiterate on the subject of world politics. At least the father was a former ambassador, former CIA director and former Vice-President. His ignorant son had never heard of bin Laden, the Taliban, or Afghanistan prior to successfully stealing the election from his Democratic opponent, Al Gore.

Since 15 of the 19 suicide pilots were Saudis, it seemed plausible that the Al Queda chieftain was indeed the man who had ordered the 09-11 attack. Therefore international public opinion, mostly outside the Islamic world, easily fell for the White House presentation of what supposedly happened. After all, President Bill Clinton had already fired several dozens cruise missiles at the Afghan mountains, where bin Laden was operating. As a matter of fact, years ago the Clinton Administration formally issued orders to the CIA to find the elusive Saudi and shoot him point blank. Today's US Foreign Policy allows straight executions of suspected enemies. Israel hastened to copy this Mafia behavior against Palestinians. Antiquated norms like observing due process of law no longer figures in the minds of US-Israeli decision-makers. In view of this openly announced US decision to murder him, the attack of 09-11 could be explained as a pre-emptive strike by Al Queda, if we allow bin Laden to practice the same defensive measures as Bush. Or do we only allow Americans to do as they please? Throwing their weight around unopposed.

Junior Bush went mad after being attacked by what he interpreted as a terrorist strike against the United-States. How could irregular guerrillas in the Tora Bora mountains possibly get away with this? The punishment had to be swift and deadly. He told the public, that he was going to enter Afghanistan and get the bastard 'dead or alive'. That was twenty months ago.

Bin Laden is a dedicated warrior. He leads an international resistance movement against US-Israeli imperialism. Scott Ritter, former UN weapons inspector in Iraq (1991-1998), called the Bush doctrine of pre-emptive military action a form of unilateralism that reeks of imperialist power. The other Bush objective of regime change, Ritter called a direct American

breach of the UN Charter, which specifically prohibits regime removal. The moment that a US president signs a secret directive to kill Osama bin Laden, or anyone else, he automatically becomes liable to be classified as a classic war criminal. But, of course, the present gang of four (Bush, Cheney, Powell and Rumsfeld) is not aware of the fact that someone, some day, will indeed bring indictments against them before a court of law.

In deference for the smoking rubble in Manhattan on the Hudson, most of the world kept silent and seemed to understand Bush's need to let off steam by carpet-bombing Afghanistan in search of bin Laden. It must be recalled, that in the late thirties Adolf Hitler and Hermann Goring invented, and practiced thereafter, the massive bombing of open cities by big fleets of Heinkel, and Junker bombers accompanied by Messerschmitt fighters and Stuka dive-bombers. This amounted to the near total destruction of open cities killing hundreds of thousands. As a boy of 14, I witnessed the Nazi bombing of Rotterdam, resulting in the early capitulation of the Netherlands to Hitler. For years, we lay awake at night, as large squadrons of allied bombers began their nightly raids on sleeping German cities, crossing the skies of Holland. Washington and London replied in kind and organized their own flying armadas to repay the Nazis for their bloody sins. Americans should take into account what are the deeper psychological reasons for Europeans to be reluctant to take part in destroying this time Iraq.

The US revenge for the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor came four years later when two atomic bombs, the first in human history, were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Almost a quarter of a million innocent Japanese burned to death in 1945. Few of us noticed that Washington had gradually copied Hitler's tactics forcing the surrender of Japan through mass murder. Whoever ordered four airliners to crash into the WTC and the Pentagon, they were certainly copying from both Hitler and Truman. Nevertheless, again, compared for instance to the ruins of Stalingrad in World War II, the collapse of the WTC in Manhattan was a minor rich man's disaster. Not to mention Hiroshima once more.

Yet, 09-11 became a welcome excuse for, what the Bush Administration considered a perfect right to declare some fellow members of the United-Nations 'rogue states', and others, 'an axis of evil' (North-Korea, Iran, Iraq). To the minds of the Bush clique, labels as 'rogue nations' made it perfectly legitimate for the US, if it so decided, and without further agreement from the UN, to wipe them off the map. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld wants permanent rapid response forces to go at any time anywhere at very short notice. This global cop unit could strike anywhere with or without the authority of the host nation. The US would provide the firepower. Europeans would provide 'the soft power', meaning, clean up the mess after the Yanks have left. Rumsfeld is quite neurotic, but most Americans assume he is a man of courage and a bold defender of basic US values.

Washington prefers political cover from Europe for its subversive actions on all continents. However, contrary to Bush I, the son decided, if needs be, to carry out his policy without UN

permission or without wide coalition support. Perhaps, Tony Blair managed to delay a war against Iraq by toning down the homemade Texan rhetoric of his friend George. But the gap between what the US, compared to Europe, contributes in the fields of military manpower, finance, technology and massive bomber or missiles forces, has long become unbridgeable. Accordingly, Washington is increasingly distrustful of Europe and reluctant to share its military might with anyone. Therefore America acts - as annalist Peter van Ham stated in a pamphlet on the future of NATO - 'more and more as legislator, policeman, judge and executioner.'

If the President of the United States in 2003 was an experienced statesman, well versed in international affairs, knowing his history and perfectly able to present himself as an intelligent, superior, well-educated person, this would add to America's current status of sole super-power. Instead, mankind is faced with a very ignorant hillbilly from the back of beyond from Crawford, Texas, who was thrust into a role he is obviously totally unfit for. And the world feels and knows it. Such are the blessings of the US democratic election process. Any idiot, who is able to talk nonsense with a straight face and builds himself the right political network and scrambles sufficient millions, can run for the White House.

The present simpleton from Texas has uninterruptedly worked on the unilateral demolition of the world's treaties and agreements. He dumped the anti-ballistic missile treaty, he sabotaged the biological weapons convention, he rejected the Kyoto protocol on climate change, he opposed the UN treaty on gunrunning and he withdrew from underwriting the international criminal court. Bush II is pulling away from the rest of the world and destroying international cooperation in doing so. According to *The Guardian*, this president feels that there is no point in possessing brute strength if you are not prepared to be brutal. Or, even worse, threatening anyone with naked military force, who will not listen to US demands.

Diplomacy Bush style means, that Washington is fully prepared to use 'new bunker busting nuclear weapons' in the case of war. Father Bush used one of the more advanced bunker busting weapons in 1991 on an underground shelter in Baghdad. I visited this place, where hundreds of women and children were burned to death. General Norman Schwarzkopf gambled that Saddam had been hiding there. America was simply testing the effects of the latest killing machines on innocent Arab civilians. The Saudi pilots of 09-11 were clever enough to use made in USA flying bombs.

For some of US, citizens of former colonial empires, and veterans of World War II, it is horrifying to note, that the 21st century again begins with elaborate Washington war talk. For instance, the latest sensors at the disposal of US bombardiers flying at stratospheric heights over Afghanistan were picking up unusual noises. To play it safe the pilots dropped bunker busters unaware of the fact that they were hitting an Afghan wedding party. This happened not once, but repeatedly. For the American public and media, tragic events like these are but footnotes to history. The latest trick to soothe the conscience of US or Is-

raeli war criminals is to call the loss of hundreds of women and children in a Baghdad shelter or a massacre at Jenin in the occupied Palestinian territories just 'collateral damage'.

It is hardly surprising, that persistent incidents of this nature, perpetrated by America and Israel, are beginning to cause serious opposition resulting in the largest worldwide antiwar demonstrations ever seen. The conscience of humanity is beginning to resist this high-handed warlike US-Israeli behavior. Why do Americans and Israelis assume they can impose their will on others with methods belonging to the dark ages of imperialism? That is why the world is now faced with countless resistance movements figuring out ways to strike back at both the US and Israel for what they have been doing to others for over half a century. That is the only reason why America experienced the 09-11 disaster. That is also the reason mankind is lately experiencing the heroism of suicide bombers. How do people resist the most automated war machine in history but with their bare hands and bodies?

In today's Washington they even grace the Lord for never having signed a nuclear test ban treaty, because it enables the White House to draw the Harry Truman nuclear card, if need be on Iraq, Iran or North Korea. Attending a security conference in Munich, Donald Rumsfeld was left speechless and did not understand that NATO partners, France and Germany, were not eager to plunge head-on into a war against Iraq. 'It is difficult to believe,' he said, 'there could still be any question in the minds of reasonable people open to the facts before them.'

In the mind of a pitiful warmonger like Rumsfeld, also a stern supporter of any crimes committed by Ariel Sharon, it is a clear and an undeniable fact, that Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden are blood brothers. The Iraqi president has made it abundantly clear, that if bin Laden indeed was his friend, he would not be ashamed to say so. Baghdad might sympathize with fellow Arabs fighting US-Israeli war crimes, but that does not automatically mean, that a Saddam-bin Laden Axis would approach as much as a reality. Let alone, that they schemed together to attack on the US. The Bush Administration has frantically tried to utilize this scenario as proof and make the world believe it. Secret meetings in Prague were invented and countless trial balloons launched to pull off another ludicrous fabrication to accuse Saddam of complicity with Al Queda.

Many Americans, and above all those presently occupying the White House, are incapable of understanding, that Muslim opposition coming from Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan, Hamas, Palestinians or Al Queda, and other places, is not directed against individual Americans, but solely and entirely against US-Israeli aggression preventing Muslims from regaining their legitimate genuine rights of self-determination. Even the Saudi suicide pilots of 09-11, did not despise or hate Americans. All signs were that they loved to learn to fly and live in Florida. That they eventually agreed to fly commercial airlines into US buildings was their ultimate act of Muslim defiance and patriotism against US global arrogance, which continues to look upon Islam as archaic and unfit for the 21st American century. Who in the Muslim world aspires to become a cloned Yankee?

Americans seem to feel that exporting their way of life can be achieved just as any ordinary commercial commodity and must be as easy as selling hamburgers, Coca Cola or Kentucky Fried Chicken. Compared to the Chinese, Indians, Russians and Arabs, French and other nationals, Americans lack basic common psychological and cultural roots. What they are all primarily engaged in is a blind race to acquire more of the almighty US dollars. Americans are a mishmash of leftovers from all over the world including the old Europe. Together they founded a brand new republic some 200 years ago, and created a place of their own in the sun. Now they mistakenly feel that they have to offer, and sometimes impose, their way of life as the ultimate salvation to the rest of humanity. In reality, they are really only interested in controlling, exploiting and ruling the rest of mankind. It is a new 'song', called 21st century imperialism, which is just another wolf in a cloned sheep's clothing.

However, people shape autonomous minds. A person's brain represents the organized totality of psychological processes that enables the individual to interact with the environment. A mind is the totality of a person's conscious experiences. When one compares the processes of perceiving, thinking, remembering or intelligent behavior of president's Reagan, Bush 41 and Bush 43 with, for instance, the Ayatollah's in Iran, Saddam Hussein, Kim Il Song or Osama bin Laden, then it is safe to say, that a lot of quiet talking and listening to each other is needed in order for them to first understand each other, and then to reach a *modus vivendi* to bring about peace for all.

Yankees, who constructed the basis for their overwhelming prosperity - as Hitler once did - on the notorious military-industrial complex, feel that by carpet bombing the Axis of Evil into the Stone Age, it will ensure that everybody will want to accept the American way of life. Those who do not listen and refuse to accept what Washington prescribes to the world as a shortcut to happiness and prosperity for all, will have to reckon seriously with being plastered with cruise missiles or Daisy Cutters, as the people of Afghanistan and Iraq most recently experienced. Who will be next?

Israel, the 51st American state in the heart of the Arab world, has developed a similar national psychology and strategy. The United-States makes its war machine willingly available to fellow Jews to enable them to consolidate their power against the overwhelming opposition of the region. Of course, a man like junior Bush, who does not lie awake at night after having stolen a free election from his opponent, has no qualms in disregarding the fact that if today a referendum were organized among 280 million Muslims in the Middle East, the state of Israel would cease to exist. Therefore, Bush and Sharon share the criminal use of Apache helicopters and the latest inventions in rocketry to terrorize Arabs and Palestinians into submission. I fail to observe any difference between Nazi methods of Hitler and Mussolini and those of Bush and Sharon. Would Americans allow the establishment of an Al Queda state on the North American continent? Remember how they became hysterical when Cuba started a Marxist experiment in the early 60's.

Osama bin Laden's war against foreign domination is as much

the result of US blunders as was Fidel's a natural reaction to prolonged US imperialism in Cuba. In 1991, the then Defense Secretary, Dick Cheney managed to convince the Saudi ruling family, that the elder Bush would be sending thousands of soldiers to the desert kingdom to assist them in fighting off an Iraqi invasion. Attacking Baghdad was never contemplated. Cheney assured them, that US soldiers would leave after a US victory. But, of course, Bush 41 and Cheney had never planned to evacuate Saudi Arabia after Desert Storm ended. They did not keep their word to the king. Former Soviet states in Central Asia, that allowed US troops in under the pretext to fight terrorism, should keep in mind this lesson learned by the government in Riyadh. History is repeating itself. Once, Hitler's soldiers had marched into European countries they never had the slightest intention to ever leave again.

When Osama bin Laden returned from Afghanistan, having assisted in the ousting of the Soviets from Muslim land, he planned to quietly resume his family business. However, to his surprise he found thousands of 'infidel' US soldiers on Saudi soil. He changed his mind. He set himself a new goal, which was to correct what he considered an unacceptable occupational situation. It can be safely assumed that if only father Bush and Cheney had withdrawn the US military from the desert kingdom in 1991, there would never have been even an Al Queda.

The death toll on 09-11 in New York caused mass hysteria in America. The old sense of security of being the mightiest power on earth had been seriously undermined. Elsewhere, however, the WTC calamity was often viewed with a feeling of déjà vu. The method, using commercial airliners, was indeed new. Lasting only minutes, it caused 3.000 deaths. But that is hardly comparable to the US bombing Southeast Asia for 15 years bringing about millions of deaths. After half a century of American war crimes all over the globe, the chickens had finally come home to roost. The airliner trick was the first real answer from barefoot, unarmed masses to rampant American global terrorism. Bush is convinced 09-11 was an Al Queda operation. It would never occur to him that a cabal of US and Israeli cloak and dagger boys might have prefixed 09-11 to make it look as if Osama bin Laden was the evildoer. Nor would it be the first time that an American president had been lied to by his own intelligence services.

After all, the US military industrial complex never ceases to search for new opportunities to flex its muscles in defense of the fatherland. The 09-11 catastrophe presented the ideal opportunity to gather public support for an entirely new kind of war. It was only recently discovered, as to what type of dangerous schemes Washington is capable of plotting when the most outrageous Mafia behavior is considered normal and acceptable. For instance, in 1961, the US chairman of the Joints Chief of Staff, General Lyman Lemnitzer, sent a detailed plan to JFK called Operation Northwoods. It was so designed to appear to the world, that America had every reason to set off a pre-emptive strike against Cuba. At the time, Fidel was the Osama bin Laden of the sixties.

Lemnitzer proposed to JFK that a bloody war of terrorism should be started inside the US, in order to get public support for a pre-emptive strike against Cuba. Lemnitzer suggested, in writing, to have innocent people shot in US streets. Boats carrying Cuban refugees would be sunk on the high seas by the US military. A wave of terrorist acts would be launched by the military in Washington D.C., Miami and other US cities. Planes would be hijacked. People would be framed for bombings they did not commit and using phony evidence, everything would be blamed on Castro. Hence, general Lemnitzer and his partners in crime would have had a perfect reason to declare war on Fidel. What guarantees do we have that present day US decision makers are not also capable of ordering similar shameless atrocities? Obscene insanity's? Forty years from now, we will know for certain what the real schemes were and understand the lies were told about Saddam Hussein and Iraq.

During and after World War II, Washington has continuously bombed faraway people and places, plotted coups d'état everywhere, had democratically chosen leaders hacked to pieces or had them assassinated through bribing traitors. US-CIA sponsored regime change in Indonesia, Cambodia, Ghana, Congo, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Grenada, Panama, Chili and many other states has resulted in the deaths of millions and millions of innocent people. Most Americans are simply unaware that these murderous pogroms, carried out in their name, took place at all. Following 09-11, they repeatedly asked, 'Why do they hate us?' No-one hates Americans. What the world hates are the terrorist crimes by US intelligence services, too often carried out without knowledge and approval of the White House or Congress. Nations have been terrorized, blockaded, bombed, divided up, plundered and destroyed.

The present planned bogus war against Iraq is a point in case. As William Pfaff remarked in *The New York Times*, Bush might be winning a war, but at the same time, he is losing the world. November 9, 1998, Britain warned, 'Time is running out for Saddam.' September 15, 2002, Jack Straw, British foreign secretary said, 'Time is running out for Iraq.' January 14, 2003, George Bush announced, 'Time is running out for Iraq.' February 1, 2003, Tony Blair told an audience, 'Time is running out for Iraq.' These warnings from London and Washington demonstrated a chilling incompetence and a sort of day-to-day improvisation. How often can serious statesmen repeat the same threats and still expect to be taken seriously? Blair and Bush are victims of their own propaganda.

After constant US-UK reminders, that Iraq had to be blitzed for the security of the world, millions around the globe asked 'Why now?' It was a question German foreign minister, Joschka Fischer, put as a query directly to Rumsfeld. Staring him straight in the face, he stressed that he was hardly convinced by arguments put forward by the Pentagon chief. Washington's main contention being, that if Saddam were to hand over weapons of mass destruction to Al Queda, the world would be in a mortal danger. If Saddam were to acquire nuclear weapons, Osama bin Laden would soon nuke London and Washington....

Everyone, including the UN weapons inspectors, agreed that

Iraq had no nuclear weapons and will not have them in the near future. In the mean time another member off Bush's Axis of Evil, North Korea, does have operational nuclear missiles. Journalists and commentators have been asking Bush and Blair, why they went as a matter of urgency first after Iraq. As if not hearing the questions they kept replying that time was running out for Saddam. Their obsession with the Iraqi leader remains inexplicable. Don't the White House and 10 Downing Street realize that after Pyongyang the threat of Islamist extremists is much greater than that posed by Saddam Hussein? An attack on Iraq would only make matters worse. 'Osama bin Laden must be praying for a US assault on Baghdad', wrote Guardian security editor Richard Norton-Taylor.

Former conservative foreign minister, Lord Kurd, asked some rhetorical questions in the journal of the Royal Services Institute: 'Do we help or hinder the essential struggle against terrorism by attacking Iraq? Would we thus turn the Middle East into a set of friendly democratic capitalist societies ready to make peace with Israel, or into a region of sullen humiliation, a fertile and almost inexhaustible recruiting ground for further terrorists for whom Britain is the main target?'

Tony Blair only says, 'Make war now', because George Bush says so. Aside from the circulating yokes about Tony behaving like George's poodle, most people outside the US are insufficiently informed about the darker sides of the life of junior Bush prior to his dishonest grab of the American throne. Junior is, aside from everything else, a religious freak. The Reverend Billy Graham, who as guardian angel had performed a miracle over another Republican crook, Richard Nixon, also saved young George from turning into a drunkard by making him discover God in 1986.

Ninety percent of Americans replied in a recent poll that they believed in God. Eighty percent confirmed they believed in miracles. It is not Samuel Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations' we are faced with at the dawn of the 21st century, but a 'Clash of Brains' between the US and some leading European nations as to whether or not to go to war over Iraq. Perhaps, the Bush II White House represents the most overtly fundamentalist Christian Administration in memory. Cabinet meetings start with prayers. George delivers no speech without some declaration of Christian faith. Well over 50 percent of Americans say that religion is very important in their lives, compared to 16 percent in Britain, 14 percent in France and 13 percent in Germany.

Another little known aspect of the Bush II presidency is that the current most powerful man in the world is served by 'a puppeteer'. His name is, like Tony Alien-Mills reported in *The Times* of London, Karl Rove. He is a Texan-tinged mixture of Rasputin and Machiavelli. Such are the modus operandi within US democracy, that when free elections position a virtually brainless individual into the Oval Office, it becomes of vital importance, to whom this stupid man will lend his ears. The first books have appeared yet on the US market, like: *Bush's Brain: How Karl Rove made George W. Bush*. Another book: *Boy Genius: Karl Rove, The Brains Behind the Remarkable Political Tri-*

umph of George Bush is already high on the best-seller list. The authors call the president 'smart enough to know he is not smart enough.'

The writers claim, that once the attack on Afghanistan had dissolved into a fruitless chase after Osama bin Laden, Rove needed a better, simpler, more marketable war. Democrats in the Congress seem convinced, that the sudden Saddam White House strategy was a discovery of Mr. Rove. Some joke about 'general Rove', who must have been calling in more air strikes against Iraq. Rove has been working for the past twenty years with Bush. The man himself shrugs off his Svengali reputation. He is simply advising and protecting his boss.

Osama bin Laden

In November 2002, *Time* had on its cover a hazy of the Al Queda commandant with the question, 'Why can't we find him?' His trail went cold in December 2001, when his voice was last overheard somewhere in the Tora Bora Mountains of Afghanistan. American forces were insufficient in numbers at first, to start a large-scale search mission to find the man that Bush had promised to capture. The elusive Pimpernel vanished so completely, that official channels in Washington repeatedly declared him killed and over with. Nevertheless, periodically his messages are still aired on the al-Jazeera television station in Qatar, which confirms, that he's not only alive, but also still operational. In turn, almost half of all Americans remain at the same level of anxiety about possible new terrorist attacks.

Since 09-11, the United-States has been living in a chronic state of heightened alertness and helplessness, prompted by a poorly defined danger that could strike at any time again in any form and without warning. Geoffrey Cowley and Claudia Kalb wrote an article, 'Anxiety and your brain'. Fear for Al Queda can impair the immune system. Fear interrupts sleep and it exacerbates everything from acne to ulcers. Psychiatrist Carole Lieberman told the writers, 'The psychological state of fear affects us biologically. People who are anxious drink and eat more. They have more accidents. They are more likely to get colds or suffer heart attacks.' Stephen Maren, neuroscientist at the University of Michigan adds, 'A brain system is designed to keep us from getting eaten. Now it is eating away at us.'

'Fear is a paradox. Its is a response so fundamental to survival, that we share it with rodents, fishes and fruit flies,' wrote Cowley and Kalb. 'Yet fear and anxiety can shackle US, diminish our lives, can even kill us.' It has been established that during the month following 09-11, heart patients in Manhattan suffered more than twice the usual rate of life threatening heart arrhythmias. Stress hormones can also harm the brain by severing connections among neurons. Stress produces a wide range of bodily symptoms like headaches, insomnia, back pain, neck pain and disorientation. (*Newsweek*, March 3, 2003). Such is the state of affairs in America two years after 09-11. Hypertension roams around US minds. And Bush and his cohorts are further fuelling the already frantic feelings and emotions by constantly harping on the dangers of more attacks.

In the mean time hunting bin Laden continues. US authorities have put him in places like Yemen, Iran and Saudi Arabia. The White House, in an effort to demonstrate that Bush is still eager to catch him, had Condoleezza Rice stress to the media, that the president starts every single day with intelligence information on the War on Terrorism. Asked about it at a press conference, Bush himself tried to poke fun at the situation by offhandedly replying, 'We haven't heard from him lately.' Yet, signals from Al Queda operatives that are listened into on a daily basis had his collaborators saying: 'Our enemies will be killed just as you kill and you will be bombed just as you bomb. Expect more that will further distress you.' Besides the Wash-

ington gang of four, who are specifically named as the enemies of Al Queda, other US allies have also been threatened in Al Quada communications.

However, US intelligence sources believe bin Laden holes up in Pakistan's treacherous border zone, among the three million residents of Peshawar. The present search and destroy mission for bin Laden is being led by the CIA. A staff of more than one thousand specialists work full time on trying to find their man. They work from a base in Virginia. Fifty CIA officers are focusing 24 hours a day on hunting down this one Saudi fugitive. This particular office, reported *Time*, is named after a child of the first CIA officer who organized the hunt for Osama bin Laden. The name remains secret to protect that child from Al Queda retaliation, says the CIA, as if bin Laden would be crazy enough to target that child. With a cruise missile, as Bush would do. Or with an Apache attack helicopter as Sharon would do.

Furthermore: the CIA created what is called 'a red cell', consisting of twelve guys, who supposedly learned to think like bin Laden en come up with bin Laden ways what his next scheme will be for an attack on America. One wonders which bright minds are teaching these professional undercover assassins. In addition, the CIA sent dozens of agents into regions where he might be hiding. Agents try to blend in with the local population to spy, to gather information en throw thousands of dollars around in the search for suitable traitors locating their man. So far: nothing has come of it.

Miss Rice extended a conversation to Tony Alien-Mills of the London *Sunday Times* commemorating 09-11. 'The sad truth is,' said the former PoliSci professor from California, 'we know what happens when dangerous tyrants are left to their own devices and left unchallenged. We know what happens when international institutions don't act. We have a history with that. It is never good: a lot of innocent people end up suffering and dying.' Then she fantasized and said, 'We know when evil people have the means to attack you and are determined to do it. The next target wouldn't have to be New York or Washington; it could indeed be London or Berlin. I think that is what President Bush and prime-minister Blair both see.'

Alien-Mills added that Rice's disgust with Saddam was palpable when she spoke these words. What the interviewer forgot to point out was that she intentionally linked bin Laden and Saddam, as if she knew that they were partners in crime anyway. Saddam had nothing to do at all with 09-11. Even the CIA acknowledged that much. Why should Miss Rice be allowed to mislead the public from her White House office? And why did the interviewer overlooked the misrepresentation?

For Al Queda, the Islamic holy war is directed foremost towards Jews and crusaders, with America's presence in Saudi Arabia on top of the list. Iraq comes second and Palestine third. This indicates even further, that 09-11 most likely never was an Al Queda operation, as Bush & Co wanted the world to believe. Saudi Arabia is bin Laden's first real stop. As long as US troops remain in the land where the holy city of Mecca is situated, humanity can look forward to many more years of shock-

ing acts of terror. Even if the Iraqi question will be settled by an American Blitz Krieg, the Pentagon would be wise beyond expectation, when it quickly withdrew all US military personnel from the desert kingdom. Perhaps this will happen after a regime change in Baghdad. That would leave the Palestinian occupied territories and the war with Israel on top of the agenda of all Islamic freedom fighters and resistance groups.

Israel receives yearly 3 billion dollars from Washington. This is the largest aid package provided to any country. Sharon is asking Washington for 2003 4 billion in extra military assistance, 8 billion in commercial loan guarantees, resulting in a total aid package of 15 billion dollars. Will the Bush government has the nerve to ask the dismantlement of some 150 illegal Israeli settlements in Gaza and the West Bank in return? The White House not only equips the Israeli army with the latest armaments in the US arsenal, but also arms and finances the constant murderous incursions into Palestinian territory. Israeli actions amount loud and clear to first class war crimes. Since 1967, Israel has been permanently sabotaging dozens of UN resolutions on peace, disarmament, the evacuation of illegally held Palestinian territories or other resolutions unanimously condemning Israeli settlements on Palestinian land. Western press meetings always mention that Iraq has violated a dozen UN resolutions since 1991. And how about Sharon? Israel has violated all UN resolutions since 1967. Why does Washington not demand compliance from Israel? You know why. The Jewish lobby in the United-States will not allow it.

Finally, 09-11 America was attacked for the first time in several centuries. Americans immediately considered themselves at war. Those four planes were the starting shot for the war on terrorism, just as Pearl Harbor initiated the US entry into World War II. It must be recalled, however, that forty years later, it was proven that Washington provoked Japan to strike at Hawaii. It gave Franklin Roosevelt the alibi he was looking for to declare war on the Axis powers, Germany, Italy and Japan. History will tell who really initiated 09-11, presenting justification to the United-States on a silver platter to start a war on terrorism, primarily aimed at another Axis of Evil: Iraq, Iran and North Korea.

‘It is a shadowy war,’ General Colin Powell, Secretary of State, told *The New York Times*. ‘It’s a war that won’t just be fought by great armies clashing on a field somewhere. It’s going to be won, sometimes with armies clashing, but more often, it will be in the silent world of law enforcement, and intelligence exchanges and ferreting bad people where they are doing their evil deeds. It may be a war of diplomacy as we get friends who rally to the campaign, to make sure they stay with it. It may be a war of politics, where you make sure people understand in other countries that if you want to be part of this great coalition, it may cost you politically, but we are expecting you to do that...’.

Powell is not the first US general who may be a military strategist, but who has no clue as to how the rest of the world views issues of war and peace and how far away peoples feel about joining another ‘great coalition’ led by the United States

What the general calls 'bad people' are often genuine nationalists, like the Turks, or heroic freedom fighters, like the PLO, who cannot be bought or bribed by American dollars or be misled into a basically imperialist partnership. They resent US overlordship and Washington's criminal ways to saddle peoples and nations with crooks, gangsters and murderers, willing to play the colonialist game to the detriment of the interests of the people they supposedly serve. All Washington aims at in Baghdad is placing Iraq under a pro-American puppet, as is the case in most Gulf states, and thus securing the Iraqi supply of energy to the US.

One outstanding example of the down right criminal US foreign policy is Indonesia, a nation I covered for half a century. In 1965, President Sukarno was betrayed and replaced through a CIA coup. With silent agreement in Washington, a million Indonesians were slaughtered in the aftermath of regime change. Washington assisted by building on a far away Indonesian island a concentration camp for over 100.000 innocent people. After twelve years, these prisoners were gradually released from Buru island. But, following Hitler's example of issuing yellow stars for Jews to wear, Suharto had TAPOL (ex political prisoner) printed into their identification papers, to prevent them from ever working again. Notorious Paul Wolfowitz, second in command at the Bush Pentagon, can tell Americans all about it. He has been ambassador to Indonesia, where he gained quite a reputation for collaborating with fascist generals and war criminals. Suharto, who plainly committed high treason, was a CIA general who was kept in place for 32 years by an evil Axis of the US, and other wealthy nations, including Holland and Japan. They financed and armed them to terrorize Indonesians. That is the true character of a regime change made in USA.

The entire concept of 'war', in the case of a superpower, attacking with super bombers, super aircraft carriers, super blockbusters, super elite guards, resembles an elephant charging a mosquito. The Bush instant reaction to 09-11 to declare war was a gross misnomer from the start. It only served to demonstrate that the present US commander in chief did not know what he was doing. How could he? He came into his job from Texas and the beyond. The junior Bush presidency reminds US of the movie, in which the pilot is killed, and a stewardess has to land the plane on instruction of the control tower.

Americans do not deserve any better after allowing a dumbbell to grab the White House illegally. Perhaps after the present flip flopper has disappeared following the 2004 election, the US public might by that time have woken up to the reality that presidential elections are a dead serious business. May be they will have finally learnt to trust the number one job in the world to an expert in the business and not to a spoiled Papa's boy from Texas. A man, who in four years squanders US goodwill and longtime alliances down the drain. This Bush ruined partnerships, which were patiently constructed over decennia. Foremost he has played havoc with America's universal reputation.

When Powell was interviewed by the *Times*, he did not seem to realize, that even Washington's traditional allies were getting fed up with US racketeering in foreign affairs. 'Renting' warlords in Afghanistan for many millions of dollars might be stan-

dard practice for the White House or at Foggy Bottom in winning wars, but a lot of people in this world, including some of America's closest allies, are not prepared to join in that kind of rat race. Bribing friends to join and threatening allies, if they refuse to become partners in crime, are practices that most modern advanced nations abandoned in the 20th century.

A case in point was the shameless and highly embarrassing US efforts to buy Turkey's support in exchange for a package of 26 billion dollars in order to invade Iraq from Turkish soil. The White House and idiot Bush must have been fully aware of the fact that over 90 percent of the Turkish people were against US soldiers using their land as a staging ground against fellow Muslims. What kind of friend or ally of Turkey is Bush anyway? Why place the Turkish government in an untenable position to force them into making a choice between national honor and dirty dollars? Of course, junior would not know from Adam how genuine democratic decisions are being made. Coming from a circle of shifty crooks in the oil business, Bush uses the customary arm-twisting of US petroleum barons accustomed to have his way. But in the end, he will meet his Waterloo, since his insane actions will only cause thousands and thousands of additional Muslim freedom fighters to join the ranks of Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein, or their heirs.

Eventually, America and the rest of the world will collide head-on over the American method to impose its will on others. Increasingly nations are unwilling to bend to US blackmail and more and more governments demonstrate they are not for sale, and are ready to face US blackmail head-on. Even America's genuine friends are turning away, since high-handed fuzzy political games are no longer being accepted, neither by erstwhile allies like France and Germany. Powell mistakenly assumed he could quickly form another 'grand coalition' to fight a second war in Iraq under the banner of wiping out terrorism. Initially, it did look as if everyone would fall into line following the catastrophe in Manhattan. But gradually, unfavorable winds blew from various directions. Sobering reminders of 250.000 dead Japanese in 1945 brought 09-11 back into a clearer perspective.

It was soon recalled, that the US had also introduced chemical warfare in Southeast Asia in the 60's. Vietnamese doctors estimate today, that apart from the tens of thousands of deaths 40 years ago, even today 70.000 Vietnamese still suffer from various illnesses resulting from the US spraying that country with millions of tons of Agent Orange (*The New York Times*, Philip Boffey, September 8, 1998). Bush and his buddy Blair keep harping on the fact that the monster, Saddam Hussein, gassed some of his own people. The biggest attack occurred in March 1988 in Halabja, where 6,800 Kurds were gassed and killed.

George Bush, who is probably unaware of America's war crimes track record anyway, continuously coughs up particularly cynical justifications for regime change in Baghdad by referring to Saddam's killing fields. After analyzing thousands of US government documents, *The New York Times* reported (January 17, 2003) that Washington deliberately blamed Iran for the Halabja massacre, while knowing full well that Saddam had

used chemical weapons provided by the US and UK. Even the State Department instructed its diplomats to blame Iran and not Iraq, being aware that the US and its allies had supplied Iraq with the means to conduct chemical warfare. Washington sided with Baghdad, since Saddam was looked upon as a lesser evil while the government in Teheran was seen as representing a more dangerous zealous brand of politicized Islam.

‘Sealed by National Security Decision Directive 114 in 1983, the tilt toward Iraq included billions of dollars in loan guarantees and other credits,’ reported *The New York Times*. ‘Sensing correctly that it had carte blanche, the Saddam regime escalated its resort to gas warfare, graduating to ever more lethal agents. Because of the strong Western animus against Iran, few paid heed. Then came Halabja.’ Iran rushed western journalists to the stricken town and Ted Koppel showed the horrifying scenes of thousands of gassed people on his program *Nightline*.

In response for having been caught red handed as a solid partner of Saddam, the Pentagon quickly concocted stories showing how Iran had first attacked Iraq and had committed similar crimes against humanity. Documents show, that the State Department again issued instructions to diplomats not to discuss Halabja overseas at all. Today, the gang of four is mentioning Halabja almost daily to underline the need for regime change in Baghdad. In the words of the *Times*, ‘Those figures who engineered the building up Iraq, so that it could invade Kuwait and get away with it, are back in power in the second Bush Administration. They have yet to account for encouraging Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs by giving the regime a de facto green light on chemical weapons use and for turning a blind eye to Iraq's worst atrocities, and then lying about it.’ (January 17, 2003).

In 2003, Bush junior is trying to improve his father's record in these matters. The son said in his inaugural address to the nation in 2001, ‘An angel still rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm.’ He was referring not to his plans to gather another storm around Iraq, but to the books of Job and Ezekiel. At the same time, his religious feelings hardly seem to stand in the way of his blatant lying. Neither do his religious convictions prevent him or his team from using every economic and financial trick in the American super-power arsenals book to force his will on the United Nations. Thereby compelling the Security Council to agree to his intentions, this, amongst others, is to bring his father's former tormentor in Baghdad to book. Be it dead or alive.

In the mean time, it is more than clear, that if junior is mad enough to go it alone against Iraq, terrorist dangers for Americans will sharply increase. The CIA had already warned in October 2002, that it must be expected that Saddam will adopt terrorist actions against any invaders. The CIA held it plausible that Iraq might well order weapons of mass destruction against US and UK troops. Or, as Nicholas Kristof wrote in the *Herald Tribune*, ‘It seems a bad idea to sacrifice the lives of allied soldiers - along with billions of dollars - in a way that may add to Americans' vulnerability.’

Bush remains unmoved by worldwide opposition to his possible use of force against Iraq. David Sanger reported in the *Times*, that the president was speaking early in March 2003 as if he had already deposed the Iraqi leader. Bush' aides let it be known, that 'in the mind of their boss, the old debate whether Saddam will disarm is over.' Bush is hardly the first world leader hanging on to false beliefs that cannot be modified by reasoning or a clear demonstration of facts. Persistent and systematic delusions are characteristic of a psychotic state of mind, which seems an accurate description of President Bush' current condition of mental health. Who is going to send him to a shrink?

Thousands of Americans want to oust Bush. US Congressmen have received one million e-mails urging them to sack Bush and stop the war. In the mean time, in the 180-year-old hall of the Oxford Union a British student describes the Bush doctrine and the United States as 'a super rogue state'. 'Is America a monster?' asked Alan Cowell in a headline in the *Herald Tribune* (March 1, 2003). Or, as British Labour legislator phrased it, 'The America that we indict today is the illegitimate America of George Bush.' These citations about Big Brother across the Atlantic had never been heard of in good old England. One hundred years ago, the UK was the sole global superpower. Great-Britain ruled territories from Canada to Australia. America was in those days a financial and cultural dependency of London. This was much resented in Washington by Americans who were emerging from their rebellion against London. Now it is America's turn to rule the waves of the oceans of the world. If Lord Black of Crossharbor, the owner of the *Daily Telegraph* of London, already poses the question, 'Is it in Britain's national interest to be America's principal ally?' we know that times are changing once more.

While the nitwit from Crawford must have been aware that the tide in the world was massively turning against his crazy adventures, Bush stuck to his asinine slogan, that those who were not for him had to be against him. He continued to demand total allegiance from his friends and allies, Tony Blair being foremost among them. Bush ignored the overwhelming public opinion within their own nations and for better or worse demanded that they support him whether they agreed or not. Prime ministers Berlusconi (Italy) and Aznar (Spain) were urged to disregard monumental opposition within their own countries to the war. Eighty percent of Italians and eighty percent of Spaniards were against war with Iraq. The urgent plea from Bush to Berlusconi and Aznar was to flatly defy their democratic majorities and support him instead. This only further underlined what kind of democrat this ringleader from Texas really is. Do we Europeans need an ally or super-power protector like the United States? Hasn't the time arrived, for Europe to cease dancing to Washington's tunes and stand on two feet? At the end of the day, Western Europe has much more in common with Eastern Europe and Russia. The future of Western European peninsula lies in the East as far as Kamchatka and not with the New World.

When historic events like 09-11 are eventually seen in retro-

spect and will be properly decoded, people will have more information and thereby gain a more accurate view of what actually happened. Much of the first traumatic shock effect will dissipate opening the way to a much calmer reflection over the coming half century. The United-States has bombed and killed people everywhere and has never received a single explosive in return. Whoever was responsible for 09-11, presented America with an urgent wake-up call. Instead, Washington continued in its old ways and could only think of one standard reply, throw more blockbusters, as they did on Afghanistan.

At the time of this writing, illegal pre-war US-UK bombardments are being stepped up against Iraq. America is a deeply disturbed nation, ignorant of its own misconceptions about the rest of the world. They are blind to America's massive crimes perpetrated against humanity everywhere since World War II. Americans appear to be unable to understand that the emotional life of nations differs on all continents. They are mistakenly convinced their way of life is best suited for all mankind. Somehow, they have convinced themselves that God has bestowed it upon them to convert the earth into one big Disney Yankee Park.

What happened these first months of 2003 is truly comparable to Harry Truman having to decide in 1945 whether to end World War II by nuking Japan. The decision to attack Iraq as second stage in the War on Terrorism falls into the same category as the dilemma JFK found himself in during the Cuban missile crisis. Bush seems ready to take the mother of all presidential gambles by following Paul Wolfowitz' dictum, 'that America should end all states that sponsor terrorism.' Not only is junior Bush unfit and ill equipped to make such a fateful decision but he is also surrounded by saber-rattling advisors, who seem intent on encouraging him to make a fool of himself. Even former White House advisors, Generals Wesley Clark, Norman Schwarzkopf and Brent Scowcroft, and including Henry Kissinger have all made it abundantly clear, that they are against considering Iraq a legitimate target in the War on Terrorism. The son of their former boss does.

Amazingly enough, when Bush ran for the White House, he advocated 'a humble foreign policy', and said to Al Gore, that it was not the job of the president of the United States to say, 'this is the way it has to be.' If Osama bin Laden was responsible for 09-11, for which nobody ever submitted any proof, the Al Queda chief inadvertently succeeded in letting Bush make a decisive U-turn in foreign affairs. As Simon Jenkins reminded us in the London *Times* (September 13, 2002), the US president told the United Nations one year after 09-11 that the world organization should get rid of President Saddam Hussein or he, Bush, would do the job himself.

Without presenting any killer evidence against Saddam either, Bush kept defining the Iraqi leader as another time bomb waiting to explode. Jenkins reminded his readers, 'At first, Mr. Bush promised only to hunt down and punish those responsible for 09-11. Two weeks later, he was at war against every terrorist group of global reach. After Afghanistan and the military debacle at Tora Bora and Operation Anaconda, he did not re-

trench but sought new fields of intervention.’ Indeed, the notorious War on Terror went abstract. After a shaky adventure in Afghanistan, Iraq clearly became the next overriding White House obsession. It must be even questioned whether Kabul was not only a diversionary tactic. Had the march on Baghdad not been the primary goal in the first place of the forces that brought the junior Bush to the White House?

Bush and his comrades at the White House clearly developed persistent and irrational ideas accompanied by a blind compulsion to act. The evil of the 09-11 calamities cried for revenge. Bush and his cohorts developed a full-blown neurosis characterized by the presence of obsessive ideas and crazy actions. The latest blunt arguments coming out Washington against a Russian-French veto in the Security Council against war, were that it was ‘immoral and undemocratic when a majority of nine votes would be cast for an invasion into Iraq, that France and Russia would nevertheless use their veto power.’ The US is using every undemocratic and dictatorial method it can think off, to blackmail instance Turkey, Italy and Spain into supporting the super-power against the will of the overwhelming majority of their electorates, yet the White House shamelessly talks about undemocratic attitudes of China, Russia, France and Germany.

When a retired British general practitioner told the *Daily Telegraph* (February 17, 2003), ‘I just think Bush is mad,’ Tony Blair should have realized, that he was losing support fast among the public. ‘I think,’ this MD continued, ‘that Bush is as mad as Hitler was. And Blair is the equivalent of Rudolf Hess.’ He hoped his Prime Minister would eventually get out of the Bush trap, as Hess tried to flee Nazi Germany. Blair, on the contrary, continued to stress that his US partner in crime was not the simpleton people around the globe take him for. In the mean time, increasing numbers of Blair's fellow-citizens began to question seriously the sanity of the American president and his coconspirators for war.

Norman Mailer felt that eight months into his presidency, Bush's ‘diabolical luck’ occurred on 09-11. The president's popularity wavering at 30 percent soared to well over 90. ‘It was as if our TV sets had come alive. For years, we had been watching maelstrom extravaganzas on the tube and enjoying them. We were insulated. A hundredth part of ourselves could step into the box and live with the fear. Now, suddenly, the horror had shown itself to be real. Gods and demons were invading the US, coming right in off the TV screen.’ The typical Yankee reflex ‘beat everybody’ originated on 09-11 and was fully exploited and enlarged upon by the man from Texas. What if Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein would get together and Iraq would deliver some of its weapons of mass destruction to Al Queda?

‘The inner diktat of George Bush to go to war with Iraq as rapidly as possible now had to face the likelihood that Saddam had come up with an exceptional counter-move. Was he saying in effect, Allow me to string along the inspections, and you are still relatively safe. You may be certain I will not give my very best stuff to Osama bin Laden, so long as we can keep playing this inspection game back and forth. Go to war with

me, however, and Osama will smile. I may go down in flames, but he and his people will be happy. Be certain, he wants you to go to war with me.'

Mailer catalogued the irrational fantasies and obsessive suspicions roaming within Bush's mind. America's spiritual architecture was buttressed since World War II by near mythical feelings of security. The 09-11 shock treatment destroyed that basic figment of America's imagination. Suddenly, the number one super-power in the world had become incredibly vulnerable. Now a Texan lives in the White House. He deeply believes in the mad-eyed magic, that Americans can do anything they want to. He also seems irrationally convinced, that the destiny of the world depends on the United-States. Therefore, there is but one way forward in this crisis of security for all Americans, and that is to strive for World Empire. If brute force is required to guarantee Americans total safety in their homes and cities, then America will be ordered to flex its military muscles to the fullest.

Parallel to the War on Terrorism we see developing a War on Non-Cooperation. Already months after 09-11 a US ambassador simply stayed away from a meeting that discussed the comprehensive test ban treaty at the UN. Hardly had Hans Blix been nominated chief UN weapons inspector, when it was announced, that the CIA had received instructions to investigate this former Swedish Foreign Minister hoping his credibility could be undermined. When no wrongdoing of Blix was discovered, deputy US Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz reportedly hit the ceiling.

Next, Washington succeeded in ousting Dr. Robert Watson as chairman of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Watson had tried to convince member states to take global warming seriously. The Exxon Mobil oil company complained in a memorandum to the White House and Watson was given his walking papers. In a report in the *Guardian* called 'Diplomacy US style', it was illustrated how America was pulling away from the rest of the world, dragging existing treaties down as it goes. Why is the US going to such lengths to destroy international cooperation?

The analyst, George Monbiot, wrote, 'War would enable the US to re-establish its authority in an increasingly wayward Middle East, while asserting control over Iraq's vast oil reserves. Iraq is also daddy's unfinished business: for George junior it is personal. War is popular: the more bellicose president Bush becomes, the higher his ratings rise. It justifies increasing state support for the politically important defense industry.' It is clear, that the man from Texas is possessed by obsessive rage against tin pot dictators and shadowy scarlet pimpernels like Osama bin Laden, who dare to challenge the almighty US. Nevertheless, his continued standard answer to these nuisances appears to be, bomb them back into the Stone Age.

Junior Bush, the so-called democrat at home has become a tyrant abroad. It was 09-11, that presented him with a license to change the global rulebook. Perhaps, he is not even aware that he is demolishing one by one the world's agreements and treaties. He has no clue anyway what the United Nations stands

for or what the hard fought principles are that humanity fought for since the creation of the UN in 1945 in San Francisco. Since the man descended on the White House he steered America into splendid isolation by setting his own rules. That might work as governor of Texas. It does not work as CEO of the United States.

As Andrew Gumbel noted in the London *Independent*, ‘There are few signs of self-doubt in the White House. George Bush is the master of his own presidency.’ This Texan amateur is shooting straight from the hip. He is blissfully uninformed about the intricacies of International Law, and has little knowledge of the basic tenets on which the UN Charter is based. He simply follows his gut feelings and bluntly warns that if the UN keeps dragging its feet, he will go after Saddam alone. Perhaps these are manners and methods he picked up during a short stint in the Texas oil industry, but they do not work in the field of international politics or diplomacy.

Recently, the London *Times* (February 25, 2003) published a page to allow professor Nicholas Grief, chairman of the School of Finance & Law of Bournemouth University to argue for the possibility that Tony Blair and his mentor George Bush could be guilty of war crimes in preparing an attack on Iraq. Article 6 of the Nuremberg Charter of 1945 describes a crime against peace as including planning, preparation or initiation of war. Article 6 even includes the participation in a common plan or conspiracy or any of the foregoing. Crimes against peace carry individual responsibility. This means that Bush and Blair could be held personally responsible and be charged for these crimes in one of their national courts. The *Times* report added, ‘The idea that the two men could be entering the same legal territory as the Nazis of Nuremberg does focus the mind.’

Bush's conspiracy

Not a day passed, during which the present ongoing life and death struggle between Arab, American and Israeli minds took the student of international relations aback by incomprehensible noises from all sides. 'I am not a textbook player, I am a gut player,' said George Bush to Bob Woodward, author of *Bush at War*. (Simon & Schuster, New York, 2002). This president kept talking of 'his instincts' as if they were a second religion. Five days after 09-11 Bush barked an order to General Colin Powell, that he should at once issue an ultimatum to the Taliban ordering them to hand over bin Laden. Even a Texas High School student recognizes that it does not work that way. Bush threatened, 'And if they do not comply, we will attack Afghanistan. Let's hit them hard. We are going to rain holy hell on them. You have got to put lives at risk. We have got to have people on the ground...' Powell wanted time to consider this ultimatum. Bush consented. 'I want them quaking in their boots,' he warned. (Woodward pp. 97-98)

The president insisted that he needed bin Laden dead or alive. 'That is how I feel,' he added. He quickly signed a White House secret directive ordering US forces and the CIA to capture or kill bin Laden. No-one, neither Bush nor Blair, ever proved that bin Laden was the 09-11 mastermind behind the killings. The world simply took Bush's word for it and the blind accusation was parroted millions of times. Afterwards, everybody took this to be the truth, whilst others than Al Queda could have very possibly committed this crime.

Anyone who follows the news these days is faced with the impossible task of trying to decode and bring into perspective an avalanche of lies, weird mixtures of fact, fiction and pronouncements that are linked to downright criminal behavior in the highest echelons of the White House. The result of these US tactics of whipping up global fear is that anxiety for possible more of these 09-11 disasters has taken possession of people everywhere. This is noticeable from the corridors of the United Nations to the streets of Gaza, and Jerusalem. As a real fear exists that terrorism may strike anywhere at any time.

Even in an age where man can execute a suspect by firing a rocket from an unmanned Predator drone, the central nervous system of human beings remains an enigma. Listening to the current leader of America, one is reminded of Sigmund Freud's warning. Take into account that most people live in a reality that is half fact and half fantasy. As David Brooks reported in the London *Times* (March 7, 2003), the sudden waffle-free directness of the US president when speaking about Iraq alarms the fashionable doubtful commentaries about the man. 'There has been an appalling clarity and coherence to his position,' wrote Brooks. *Time* magazine was equally disturbed about 'the blinding glare of the president's certainty.' *The Los Angeles Times* described Bush's attitude with the headline 'a questionable certainty.' *The New York Times* ran a full-page editorial calling for more discussions, followed by another urgent plea the next day not to go to war. Nevertheless the man from Texas kept saying

that he had inalterably decided to take out the man from Baghdad and he continued to depict Saddam as a menace to America and the world. Another ignominious lie.

Bush's neighbor, Canadian Prime Minister, Jean Chretien, went on television to describe Bush's warnings about Saddam as nonsense. Iraq had been defeated in 1991, and has since been sufficiently disarmed as not to be a threat to anyone. With the constant presence of US and UK warplanes in the skies of Iraq, Saddam has since the Gulf War been the prisoner of the allied powers that defeated them. 'You cannot exercise your powers to the point of humiliating others,' Chretien warned. He also added that he was not prepared to allow the Americans what his policies should be. 'Canadians do not want to be looked upon as the 51st US state,' he said. (*Financial Times*, September 13, 2002).

Another classic White House dirty trick was revealed in the London *Sunday Telegraph*, March 9, 2003. This was the very week that one of the most crucial votes in international affairs had to be decided upon. Was there to be a war against Iraq? 'Bush's Blood Feud' read the headline in the *Sunday Telegraph*. The report reminded readers of rumors, spread by the CIA in 1993, that Iraq had tried to kill the then President Bush during a visit to Kuwait celebrating the defeat of Iraq in the Gulf War. George junior had stayed behind, because he was busy finding a new stadium for the Texas Rangers baseball team, which he was managing at the time. Instead of his son, daughter in law Laura accompanied then President Bush to the festivities in Kuwait.

The word in 1993 was that after the Bushes had safely returned to America, the Kuwaiti authorities had discovered a Toyota Land cruiser loaded with 175lb of plastic explosives allegedly organized by Saddam Hussein, to blow up the visiting Bush family. The attack was said to have been planned either for the arrival at Kuwait Airport or during the President's speech at Kuwait University. When I discussed this story later at appropriate levels in Baghdad, the Kuwaiti version of these CIA fabrications was denied. However, what never emerged was the fact that Laura Bush had also been in Kuwait.

The London paper revealed that Laura's husband wanted to avenge this supposed scheme by Saddam to kill both his father and wife. Of course, the so-called assassination plot was another CIA fabrication in collusion with the Kuwaiti puppets. Being the son of a former CIA director and obviously immature enough to accept anything coming out of the CIA as biblical truth, junior - according to the prestigious London paper - was lending biblical truth to whatever the CIA presented him with. Hence, the title of the story, 'Bush's Blood Feud.'

Having lived for over 50 years in the United States, I know of no other people more gullible and easily taken in by misleading stories, as those dished up by the CIA and other spy organizations, and widely circulated by the media. The Hollywoodisation of the American mind has been going on for more than half a century. Nowhere are facts and fiction as easily blurred as in the US press or on US television screens. When an otherwise sophisticated nationwide German audience could fall for a de-

magogue such as Adolf Hitler, it is not surprising, that a far less civilized and cultured US electorate could fall for a light weight like Bush junior. How is it possible that in March 2003 no less than 40 per cent of US public opinion is convinced Saddam was involved on 09-11?

After 09-11, the planning of the Afghan war started at once. A general was sent to brief the president on preliminary war plans. One option was shown on color slides showing various methods of poisoning Afghan food supplies. Condoleezza Rice was horrified and took the slides to Rumsfeld. She complained about how anyone could have been so dumb as to suggest adopting bin Laden tactics. A poison attack was what Washington feared from Al Queda. How could the US even think about doing something similar to Afghanistan? Rumsfeld reportedly scrapped yet another planned war crime.

‘It is visceral,’ Richard Reeves wrote in *The New York Times*, when Bush shouts about his loathing of North Korean leader Kim Yong Il. The president was reported to have said, ‘May be it is my religion. I feel passionate about this. I am not foolish. They tell me, we do not need to move too fast because the financial burdens of the Korean people will be so immense if we try to ... if this guy were to be toppled. Who would take care of North Koreans? I just don't buy that. Either you believe in freedom, and want to - and worry about the human condition, or you don't.’

Following this badly phrased and unintelligible presidential sentence, Reeves wrote, ‘Whatever that means - it could mean that the most powerful man in the world is planning to get rid of that loathsome creep in Pyongyang no matter who else gets hurt.’ Reeves added that the babble of the president of the United-States was, ‘also contradictory and sometimes almost incomprehensible.’ Reeves further quoted Bush directly as follows, ‘You can't talk your way to the solution of a problem. We are the leader. And the leader must combine the ability to listen to others, along with action. I believe in results. It is like earning capital in many ways. It is a way for us to earn capital in a coalition that may be fragile. And the reason it will be fragile is the reason that there is resentment towards us. I mean, you know, if you want to hear resentment just listen to the word unilateralism. Bush is an unilateralist. America is unilateral. You know, which I find amusing.’

During the many years I lectured in America, I often met people like George Bush, who equated criticism of the US with jealousy or envy for the general American public's personal wealth. Now Congressmen and editorial writers came up with the same nonsense, especially after China, Russia, France and Germany disagreed in the Security Council with Bush's policy of wanting to go to war. One day, Washington asks for regime change in Baghdad, the next they ask for the elimination of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. On the other hand, French president Jacques Chirac was crystal clear. All member nations of UN had to abide by the Charter, including the US. Chirac reasoned on the basis of existing international law. Bush, however, preferred to follow his Texas instincts and gut feelings always changing and improvising as events developed. ‘Are the

US and France heading for divorce?’ asked Joseph Fritchett in the *Herald Tribune*. Philip Delves Broughton already added in the *Daily Telegraph*, that French foreign minister, Dominique de Villepin, was holding a gun to America's back.

De Villepin was the chief architect of the French-German-Russian initiative to prevent the United-States from going to war. But both German Joschka Fischer and Russian Igor Ivanov argued together with their French counterpart, that the weapons inspectors should be given more time to complete their work in Iraq. Bush and Tony Blair both remained adamant and seemed to have decided long ago on regime change. Let's remember that the Bush gang united in the Project for the New American Century had its war plan against Iraq ready in 1998, two years prior to the Texas oil mob grabbing power. What was being played out at UN headquarters in 2003 was a gigantic battle of brains among the conspirators of the oil lobby and unsuspecting western friends and allies.

Joe Klein observed in *Time*, ‘George Bush abandoned his studied air of mild sedation only once during a primetime press conference. His eyes lighted up when he was asked if he would call for another UN vote on Iraq. A poker metaphor escaped from his Inner Cowboy, ‘It is time for people to show their cards’, he said, as if he actually enjoyed the prospect of a confrontation with France, Russia and others. The tactic was unexpected: the belligerence revealing.’ Later he displayed a classic case of being chicken. He did not dare to ask for another vote in the Security Council, knowing Colin Powell and US diplomacy had totally failed to gather meaningful support for the policy of naked aggression against Iraq. Three permanent members of the Council, China, Russia and France, representing 1,5 billion people were against war. The US & UK, representing 350 million citizens in this world were for. Concluding that they would loose they abandoned the vote and launched their war. Bush and Blair acted like war criminals.

The 43rd president of the United States offers analysts plenty of food for thought. He was calling other power's bluff in a truly breathtaking gamble. When he earlier told President Saddam, ‘The game is over,’ the Prime Minister of France reminded Bush, ‘Matters of war and peace are not a game.’ However, the rich kid from Texas didn't know any better. His inner broncobuster mentality remains an obstacle. ‘Do not put me on a couch,’ he told biographer Bill Minutaglio. Junior's answer to those who try to make sense out of the mess he is making of US foreign affairs is the standard reply, ‘Do not bother me with psycho-babble.’

Nevertheless, his biographer told *Newsweek*, that he became convinced that Bush 43 intended to surpass his dad. He bears the same name, he went to the same school, the same college, the same fraternity, and engaged in the same line of work. However, he was never as successful as his dad in anything was. This time the son intends to prove his worth. But, how can, being an illiterate in world affairs. Even recently, he said to the press, ‘If it comes to our security, we really don't need anybody's permission.’ He apparently does not know the significance of the US signature under the Charter of the United Na-

tions. This dilettante statesman probably has no clue as to what obligations America accepted under the terms of the many treaties it signed.

Times correspondent, Thomas Friedman, picked up the blunder uttered by this screwed up president. He reported in *The New York Times*, how troubling it had been to hear the president utter troubling statements. Friedman underlined that there was no indication that Iraq had the intention or the capability to threaten America. If it did, the Iraqis would be simply wiped off the map. 'This is not a war of necessity,' wrote Friedman. 'That was the case in Afghanistan. Iraq is a war of choice.' Friedman apparently accepted his government's accusation, that it was Osama bin Laden, who launched the 09-11 attack. As a journalist, I do not accept Washington's word that Al Queda was guilty of the 2001 attacks. Without the submission of facts and substantial proof, how can anyone take Washington's word for it? From this, it follows that the US and others had no actual right to invade Afghanistan. The United-States ousted the Taliban because that they harbored Al Queda and its leader bin Laden. At a future date, when more facts and information become available, it is quite possible that Washington's Afghan adventure was another US war crime.

Again, we all heard Bush waffle on for months about a coalition of the willing, prepared to die for the freeing of the people of Iraq. Support amounted to 39 per cent among Americans in favor of war: 22 per cent of the Australians: 15 per cent of the Britons: 15 per cent of the Italians: 13 per cent of the Bulgarians and only 2 per cent of the Spaniards. Delusion remains a tyrant inside the Self. Delusional imagery frequently evolves around critical foreign policy issues. Persistent and systematic delusions are characteristic for psychotic states. (See: *Delusion: Internal Dimensions of Political Life*, by James Glass, University of Chicago Press, 1985). Hence, the gang of four in Washington is the victim of its collective inner tyrant. The White House had literally nothing to fear from their declared enemy in Baghdad. Nevertheless, they are shamelessly lying to their electorate and needlessly warning them that Saddam was a danger to America and the world. Each time, when I heard Bush or Blair repeat this blatant lie over and over again, I wondered whether they had reached the point of realizing no longer that they were deceiving themselves as well.

Increasingly it became more and more difficult to find one single nation, ready to support the US against Iraq. Gary Younge noted in the *Guardian*, 'Every time turning on the news it's like watching a juggernaut heading towards a crowded play-ground in slow motion. We can see the catastrophe coming, but feel powerless to stop it.' And why does the world feel powerless? Younge: 'The irony of a man who lost an election and won a court case now all of a sudden 'installing' democracy in the Arab world is not lost on many. Not least, because if we had anything like representative democracy in the West, Bush would be in no position to do so.' (March 10, 2003).

Likewise, Blair suffered from a fit of delusion. He kept hoping that arm-twisting; horse-trading, phonetapping and vote-buying would gain the US-UK alliance sufficient votes in the

UN Security Council to launch an ultimatum to Iraq demanding total surrender by March 17, 2003. The Bush-Blair Axis of Evil similarly expected, that one week of bombing Baghdad from stratospheric heights, would simply result in killing or capturing President Saddam. Such a happy event would automatically end the war.

Washington has intended all along to install another Pinochet in Iraq. Some people seem to have forgotten, what monsters the US placed into position to do so.

Of course, Washington is aware of its record of global crimes against humanity, the current one taking place in Baghdad. Secretary-General Kofi Annan of the UN recently attended the swearing in of 18 judges of the International Criminal Court in The Hague. This court is empowered to hear cases concerning war crimes against humanity, including genocide, the bombing of civilians, and systematic rape and torture committed after July 1, 2002, regardless of the nationality of the accused. As professor Michael Byers, who teaches International Law at Duke University in North Carolina has said, Washington, with soldiers deployed in 140 countries around the world, was seriously worried that US foreign policy and military decisionmaking could be subjected to unwanted judicial scrutiny if America ratified the Court. So far, 89 countries have signed up, 50 signed but still have to ratify. Again, the United-States is entirely alone in doing everything possible to undermine this Court.

Washington has already passed legislation authorizing the President to use armed force to liberate American citizens, if the Court in The Hague held them for war crimes. The US launched a campaign to secure promises from individual countries never to surrender US military personal or American officials to the International Criminal Court. Britain broke ranks in September 2002 and sided with Washington on the subject. Still, as Professor Byers underlined, if British soldiers or American pilots were to commit war crimes in Iraq, all Saddam Hussein would have to do is send a letter to Kofi Annan. The present statute explicitly strips all leaders of all countries from immunity that might normally benefit heads of state under international law, whether their nations ratified the statute or not. This includes, according to professor Beyers, the possibility of having Bush and Blair arrested for committing war crimes.

When American Lt. Colonel Gary Fabricius brags about 40ft long lightweight unmanned drones under his command, with an armory of Hellfire missiles, that can observe, find, shoot and eliminate, he should, at the same time, be aware of the fact that executions from the skies, like Israel and the United-States have now made common practice, might very well fall under competence of the newly installed International Court of Justice in The Hague. For mysterious reasons, Americans and Israelis have adopted over the past years an apparently incurable habit of executing suspected enemies from the skies. American generals nowadays have the luxury of sitting back in their viewing rooms and watching the events of modern warfare unfold on their TV screens. 'That's the beauty of Predator drone,' said a US sergeant, 'We can take much higher risks with these aircraft

and not worry about the human consequences.’ (*Daily Telegraph*, March 11, 2003). These drones are already operating from an airbase close to the Iraqi border.

Scott Ritter, former UN weapons inspector (1991-1998), maintained that Bush's desired regime change in Baghdad was not only a violation of international law, but also unconstitutional within the context of Bush's attack on Saddam. Ritter expressed strong opposition to granting Bush sweeping war powers. For him it was a breach of constitutional responsibility on the part of Congress, which alone, under the US Constitution, is authorized to declare war. ‘I am opposed to President Bush's rush to war with Iraq,’ he wrote. ‘As signatories to the UN Charter, Americans have agreed to abide by a body of international law that explicitly governs the conditions under which nations may go to war.’

The London *Independent* in a front-page appeal directly addressed to Tony Blair put it on March 9, 2003 this way:

You do not have the evidence.

You do not have UN approval.

You do not have your country's support.

You do not have your party's support.

You do not have the legal right.

You do not have the moral right.

You must not drag Britain into Bush's unjust and unnecessary war.

What was Tony Blair's crafty reply? I am only doing what I think is right and in the interest of the country. We all know that he thinks he is right, even when *The Independent* clearly proves he is wrong, Tony still feels he is right. It all proves that Blair should consult a shrink. Some call it self-confidence, others call it arrogance, and others call it plain stupidity. This reminds us of Chancellor Dr. Konrad Adenauer's observation to Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, the British High Commissioner in Bonn, ‘It is a great pity that God limited the intelligence of man without limiting his stupidity.’ (*Power and Diplomacy*, Dean Acheson, Harvard University Press, 1958, pp. 94). Adenauer's dictum applies to Bush, Blair and those who plotted this illegal war with them.

Who remembers what George Bush said during the election in 2000 when he painted his opponent Al Gore as a naive moralist who strived to become the world's policeman? David Aaronovitch recalled in the London *Observer* that junior shouted that America was overcommitted around the world, was throwing its weight too much around, and was telling other countries far too often how to run their affairs. ‘We need to scale back, be humble and get out of the nation-building business,’ said the son of the former president in 2000 running for the White House. Who managed to make the ignorant son of a bitch change his mind?

It must be recalled that June 3, 1997 a group of rightwing zealots, among them the president's brother, Jeb Bush, governor of Florida, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld,

the notorious Paul Wolfowitz, Lewis Libby, Elliott Abrams, Richard Perle, Zalmay Khalilzaf and others established, what they called the Pro-

ject for the New American Century or PNAC. Their message three years prior to the coup to bring Bush junior to the White House, they postulated, 'The key challenge for the US is to shape a new century favorable to American principles and interests. This requires a military that is strong and ready to meet both present and future challenges. It requires a foreign policy that boldly and purposefully promotes American principles abroad. It requires national leadership that accepts United States' global responsibilities.'

On January 26, 1998 this ultra rightwing lobby group wrote to President Bill Clinton, urging him to enunciate a new open imperialist US foreign policy. They asked in 1998 for the speedy removal of Saddam Hussein from power. If Clinton failed to act, this would endanger the safety of American troops in the region, as well as cast a dangerous shadow over friends and allies, like Israel and moderate Arab states. At the same time, a significant portion of the world's oil supply would be put at risk. American policy, according to the ultra reactionaries in Washington, should not be allowed to be sabotaged by a misguided insistence on unanimity within the UN Security Council. What they were saying was, when we use our veto 76 times in the Security Council that's fine, because we know what is best for the world and for Israel. France used its veto 18 times, the USSR 4 times and China 2 times. We will not allow others to frustrate our plans by their misguided veto right, since they do not know anyway what is good for America and the world.

Three years prior to descending on the White House, the Bush junior plotters gave ample indications, as to where they stood. They were not prepared to allow the United Nations - for instance through a veto by a lesser power like France - stand in the way of their design for the 21st century. Had the world known earlier about this secret PNAC pressure-group, few would have been surprised, when in the end junior Bush, as an executor of the Project for the New American Century, ignored the UN and went ahead with his insane war against Iraq regardless what most of the rest of the world said or felt. Naturally, one of the organizers of the PNAC, Richard Perle, commented afterwards in March 2003 in the *Spectator*, 'Thank god for the death of the UN.' In 1936 Hitler and Mussolini displayed similar satisfaction upon the collapse of the League of Nations. It meant in practical terms, that from the moment they declared the League dead - as Perle declared the UN dead - they felt free to walk into other territories. Three years later, their 'incursions' resulted in World War II.

Oxford University behaviorist Richard Dawkins wrote, that Bush 43 came to the White House 'by a kind of constitutional coup d'état.' How was it possible, he asked, that among 300 million citizens, including many of the best educated, most talented, most resourceful people on earth, George Bush had to emerge on top? The way junior became president was indeed the result of a constitutional coup, when conservative judges on the Supreme Court handed him the presidency. However, it was also a political coup, because nobody among the electorate was aware at the time that a secret society like the PNAC existed

and had worked diligently for three years to ensure, that one way or the other their man would become the president. Dawkins concluded (*Guardian*, March 22, 2003), 'Saddam Hussein has been a catastrophe for Iraq, but he never posed a threat outside his immediate neighborhood. George Bush is a catastrophe for the world. And a dream for bin Laden...' Writer Harold Pinter added next day in the program *Panorama* on the BBC, 'The US with George Bush is a monster out of control.'

The PNAC ideals reflected the principle that naked US power had to become the sole controlling authority in the world. It was Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who in the 60's and 70's first sounded the alarm bell, and warned that the US was moving unmistakably in the direction of similar Nazi behavior.

It is abundantly clear that the PNAC'ers had intended, long before they grabbed power and installed their dummy in the White House, to take complete military control of the Gulf region. The only Arab leader standing in their way was Saddam Hussein. Three years prior to 09-11 the Cheney-Rumsfeld-Perle-Wolfowitz-etcetera document literally read, 'The US for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein.' As the Neil Mackay report stressed at the time, 'a secret blueprint for US global domination reveals that president Bush and his cabinet were planning a premeditated attack on Iraq to secure regime change even before he took power in 2001.'

In fact, it was George Monbiot in the *Guardian* (March 11, 2003), who, to my knowledge, first drew his reader's attention to the existence of the PNAC. The secret 'Bush for president' insider machinations were going on in Washington several years prior to the 2000 presidential election. The rightwing PNAC fanatics clearly aimed at total US hegemony, which means global law and order, US style. Closer examination of the statement of principles, dated June 3, 1997, of the Project for the New American Century fully justifies the conclusion, that indeed the most contested election in US history, the rise to power by Bush junior, was another US Putsch along the same lines as Dallas was in 1963 or Watergate, and the removal of Richard Nixon from the White House.

Late 70's another secret lobby emerged in Washington, called, The Committee for the Present Danger, which specifically aimed at the eventual overthrow of the USSR. It was clearly a forerunner of the PNAC. The earlier rightwing lobby was manned by figures like Paul Nitze, Eugene Rostov, Walt Rostov, Richard Allen, Admiral Elmo Zumwalt and others. I interviewed and corresponded with these five conspirators, whose distinct aim was the fastest possible overthrow of the Soviet Kremlin. They selected Ronald Reagan as their ideal actor spokesman. Next, they managed to get him into the White House. The choice was an excellent one serving their purpose. Ronnie was accustomed to read Hollywood scripts. Since he was also a diehard anti-communist from day one onwards, he suited the

purpose of the Committee perfectly. Others did the thinking for him. They wrote his speeches, knowing full well his brain was sufficiently blank to ask any pertinent questions.

Perhaps one of the most accurate and informative books on the fall of the USSR was written by Peter Schweizer, a fellow at the Hoover Institution in Stanford, California, a CIA thinktank. The title, *Victory: The Reagan Administration's Secret Strategy That Hastened the Collapse of the Soviet Union* (The Atlantic Monthly Press, New-York, 1994). The entire strategy to bring down Marxism-Leninism in its final stage is shown to have been restricted to members of Reagan's inner circle. What is occurring now in the White House, during the Bush II Administration, is a clear repeat of the tactics followed by The Committee on the Present Danger in the 80's. Again, a group of conservative extremists selected a largely ignorant man, but a willing tool, to present their Machiavellian conspiracy to the public and the world. Monica-gate and efforts to have Bill Clinton impeached, was a political interlude and effort for a mini-coup, that failed but was a clear forerunner of the total victory that was achieved in 2000-2001 by the PNAC'ers.

When junior entered the White House, what he needed most was a crash course in international politics. His general ignorance also meant that he was an easy prey for ultra-nationalist power-hungry maniacs. Soon after becoming the most powerful man in the world, Bush announced a rather naive but very ambitious missile defense program aimed at shooting down incoming nuclear missiles. Monbiot clarified that the real purpose of this nutty project was to turn space into a new theatre of war. The proposal was based on a document prepared by the Pentagon entitled *Vision for 2020*.

In the eighties, when working in Moscow, I recall rumors that the Russians had developed laser weapons that were to be placed on the moon capable of striking anywhere on earth that the Kremlin deemed fit. Bush favored the production of similar weapons systems that could destroy any target on earth. He made the public believe that the system he proposed was merely defensive. What he really wanted, in tandem with his PNAC buddies, was full spectrum dominance over planetary security. Suddenly, like lightening from the skies, three commercial airliners flew into three buildings in America. A fourth was prematurely brought down by the heroism of its passengers. Some professionals identified 09-11 as a comprehensive military operation, which could hardly have been planned or executed from imaginary headquarters in an Afghan cave. Nevertheless, most of the world blindly believed what the PNAC plotters had asked Bush 43 to tell them.

What if they had lied? What if they themselves were the men behind yet another combined CIA-Mossad operation, organized in Al Queda's name, to trick Muslim suicide bombers into attacking the WTC and the Pentagon? By blaming Al Queda for 09-11, the gang of four obtained massive global support for a War on Terrorism. Who benefited most from 09-11? Not Osama bin Laden, whose reward was a death warrant from Washington for what he supposedly had done. He also saw an incredibly high price, in US dollars, put on his head, to be paid

to anyone who would deliver his scalp to the White House. He was also immediately faced with the full force of US military might which underwent an intensive manhunt to find him in the Tora Bora mountain range. Everybody knows, that when Muslim freedom fighters carry out an operation against the common enemy (mostly the US and Israel) they openly claim their action. Nobody in the world claimed 09-11, while the PNAC'ers in the White House were the sole connivers who profited on a wide front from that disaster. They obtained the justification and pretext they needed to embark on a global crusade against terrorism.

Whoever did order 09-11, it gave Bush the opportunity to establish quickly an entire new range of military bases in Central Asia under the aegis of his global War on Terrorism. In reality, the inauguration of US military bases in former Soviet territories amounted to a camouflaged imperialist invasion of former enemy Soviet territory. The 09-11 disaster that led to the much-heralded War on Terrorism enabled Washington to perform the classic Trojan horse trick. It allowed the Pentagon to establish provocative forward military into Asia in favor of the PNAC's intended policy of global US hegemony. Likewise, US soldiers and jets were stationed with the utmost speed in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Georgia, which according to Washington had the sole aim of combating terrorists.

In reality, the PNAC conspirators were shamelessly exploiting the naive incredulousness of the world community, which has never even considered the possibility that ultra conservative Americans might be prepared to blow up their own people and buildings to create a super shock effect. This would obtain national and international reverberations, creating sympathy and compassion from the entire world for the WTC disaster and its three thousand victims in Manhattan.

George Monbiot posed in the *Guardian* this vital question, 'Why do supporters of the War on Terrorism find it so hard to see what is happening? Why do the conservatives who go berserk when the European Union tries to change the content of our chocolate bars look the other way when the US seeks to reduce us to a vassal state? Why do the liberal interventionists who fear that Saddam Hussein might one day deploy a weapon of mass destruction refuse to see, that George Bush is threatening to do just this against an ever-growing number of states? Is it because they cannot face the scale of the threat, and the scale of the resistance necessary to confront it? It is because these brave troopers cannot look the real terror in the eye?' (*Guardian*, March 11, 2003).

The Fourth Reich

In 2003, the Bush Government circulated its latest ideas on how to make the earth a safer place for everybody, meaning for Americans, of course. The latest White House national-security decree prior to the Iraqi War read, 'we seek to create a balance of power that favors freedom: conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty... We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers... The US national security strategy will be based on a distinctly American internationalism that reflects the union of our values and our national interests.'

Americans are self-righteously convinced that they have established the most supreme and globally acceptable social, economic and political system in the world. Hence, it's their conviction that only American values and the American way of life, is the ideal way of bringing prosperity and happiness to humanity. Americans have embarked on what they themselves imagine to be an unselfish and humanitarian crusade to bring Yankee joy and wealth to all. It never seems to occur to the Bushites and their followers that billions of people have no inclination towards the American way of life and refuse to become pseudo-Yankees.

One story we often hear repeated these days is that Americans helped to free the Old Europe and then bequeathed Marshall Plan Aid out of the goodness of their hearts. How ungrateful of Europeans to now be against US plans to conquer Iraq. One has to be extraordinarily naive to concede Santa Claus qualities to the White House. Americans love to portray them-selves as having landed on the beaches of Normandy out of affection for the French. What Washington really aimed at in 1944 was to establish a fortified Atlantic bridgehead on the Western European peninsula. Washington entered, with the defeat of the Axis powers in 1945; the next phase in its strategy to acquire world domination. The US aim all along was to bring down America's next strongest and most feared mortal enemy, a nuclear armed Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It took Washington and NATO countries half a century to blockade, to undermine and to defeat Marxism-Leninism and thus to destroy the communist dream of creating a collectivist socialist economy in which the means of production and distribution would be owned and controlled by the people. The fall of the USSR further speeded up the global dollarization of the world. Washington made a further step into the direction of the Fourth Reich. The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the United Nations are already operating in the US. When the UN was founded in 1945 in San Francisco, five major powers, China, the USSR, the US, the UK and France received veto powers. In 1945 India and Indonesia were still lingering in colonialist limbo, and Africa still found itself in colonial coma.

Half a century later the undemocratic nature of the present UN has finally entered the conscience of the world. Influential

pre-World War II states like the UK and France should have been replaced long ago by India and Indonesia totaling together 1,5 billion people lives. Talk about extending veto privileges to Japan and Germany perhaps do reflect the strength of Tokyo and Berlin bank accounts, but have little to do with the further democratization of the planet overall. If Washington means what it says, that it intends to bring democracy to, for instance Iraq, it would mean the introduction of the electoral system of one man one vote. It can be expected that following the handling of the Iraqi crisis in the Security Council in 2003 will lead eventually to fundamental changes, both in the text of the Charter of the UN as in the structure of the Security Council.

At the dawn of the 21st century we witness the rise of a Fourth Reich mentality steered by the neo Nazis who make up the bosses of the Project of the New American Century clan and their Texan and Israeli partners. American minds are clearly Mafia orientated. In *The Caine Mutiny* it was the business with the strawberries that finally convinced the doubters that something was amiss with the captain. 'Is foreign policy George W. Bush's quart of strawberries,' asked Paul Krugman in *The New York Times*. (March 15, 2003). He continued, 'Bush is the wrong man for the job. And more people than you would think - including a fair number of people in the Treasury Department, the State Department and, yes, the Pentagon - don't just question the competence of Bush and his inner circle (ed. of PNAC'ers): they all believe that America's leadership has lost touch with reality.'

Krugman warned of the debacle to come 'stirred by awesome arrogance and a vastly inflated sense of self-importance.' Bush's inner circle, the fascist PNAC'ers, claimed repeatedly, that they had sufficient votes on the Security Council to get the war against Baghdad approved. In the end, it turned out to have been all lies and more lies. The Secretary of State, and his British counterpart, did not offer any proof for their malicious allegations against the government of Iraq. They were caught redhanded trying to deceive the members of the Security Council with massively faked proof concocted by western intelligence services. Powell looked ridiculous. Even his face betrayed him when trying to deceive the world. In the end, in the face of total humiliation, since few members of the Council were prepared to be taken for a ride by Bush and Blair, the duo unchivalrously did not dare to introduce a second UN resolution knowing it would not pass. They went to war anyway. *New York Times* journalist Krugman spoke of the irresponsibility of Bush and his team and 'their almost childish un-willingness to face up to problems they don't feel like dealing with right now.'

Journalist Jonathan Rauch rendered an apt description of the basic problem with fundamentalism, not referring to religious movement, but the intellectual style. Rauch quoted Ayatollah Khomeini as perhaps the most implacable fundamentalist of the past century, who said in 1979 to an interviewer, 'I do know that, during my long life-time, I have always been right about what I have said.' Rauch further reminds us of John Locke's portrait of fundamentalism, which he called 'enthusiasm.' Enthusiasts like the PNAC'ers in today's Washington are convinced

they are not mistaken. They are unable, in Lockean terms, to infuse light into their understandings. They have the proof and need no further evidence. In the case of junior, on top of his fundamentalist approach, he feels impulses of the Spirit and the hand of God moving from within.

Rauch: 'Some people are capable of clinging to a belief despite all the contrary evidence and all the ridicule in the world, sometimes admirably, sometimes not. One man, who devoted his life to arguing that the Nazis had no policy of exterminating Jews, wrote, 'I get up in the morning, I go to the typewriter and write down the simplest things which have the most tremendous implications. I write about how all historians are wrong, how the scholars and the intellectuals and the universities are wrong and I am right'. ' (*Kindly Inquisitors*, University of Chicago Press, 1993, Chapter 4, pp. 89-111). Bush and Blair display similar convictions to be right about Iraq and Saddam. They are not.

Fundamentalist thinking is the trademark of the PNAC White House. The gang of four seems convinced, for instance, that the present huge international controversy is primarily about US policy towards Iraq and Mid East problems in general. In reality, what did cause the current impasse in US-world relations is the future place of America in the family of nations. Iraq, as *The Guardian* wrote, is a subplot in a post Cold War world. Iraq has become the catalyst of the draining power from the UN, the European Union and the NATO Alliance. Humanity is moving into another kind of civilization. History seems to be accelerating into Marshall McLuhan's concept of a global village. There will be no room for PNAC aspirations to establish a Fourth Reich controlled by oil barons in collusion with the US military industrial complex or the considerably enlarged US version of Hitler's Krupp and IG Farben's war industries. In 2003, America resembles evermore the situation of Germany under the Nazis in the late thirties. Increasingly since 1945, the US economy has developed into a gargantuan war industry. When leaving the White House even general Dwight Eisenhower felt obliged to warn of the dangerous tentacles of the military, steadily usurping more and more power, which under the Constitution should not be allowed. As former UK minister of Defense Lord Chalfont once assured me, 'One cannot continue to produce and develop new weapons systems without sooner or later using them.'

Billions of earth dwellers in the developing world survive in dire poverty. Millions more have remained illiterate. American futurologist Herman Kahn sarcastically assured me in 1971, that we had to accept the plain fact that there would always be 'the chronic poor.' Yet, in this 21st century, the far majority of fellow human beings are hardly aspiring to be annexed by PNAC good-doers and their crazy notions of what they might feel to be 'good' for them. If GI's march like Nazis into other countries bringing them so-called liberation and the blessings of the Yankee way of life, they should surely be greeted by cheering crowds, they are not, and this demonstrates how out of touch they are with the realities of the world.

I visited Baghdad twice in 2002. I drew two conclusions by

investigating conditions first hand. An attack on Iraq would be unwarranted, illegal and would never pass the Security Council in New York. I was proven wrong, because I never thought the US and UK would directly and unashamedly violate the Charter of the UN and rank themselves with outlaw states like Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, who did the same in the 30's .

Secondly, I concluded that if a military conflict would erupt, this would openly place the Iraqis on the side of the Palestinians in their guerrilla resistance against US-Israeli control and illegal occupation of Palestine. An Iraqi-Palestinian Jihad against US-UK imperial ambitions in the Middle East would undoubtedly and simultaneously be directed at the state of Israel. This would further heighten tensions and increase the dangers in a very explosive part of the world.

Bush feels ordained by humanity, which allows his crusade into Baghdad to be a legitimate way of applying US military might. He is not even aware of how close his mind resembles that of a classic Nazi. When Hitler annexed most of Europe in an effort to create one happy Nazi family on the Western European peninsula, nobody bought his message. When Hermann Goring bombed Rotterdam to force Holland to surrender, his mind was functioning as that of an ordinary war criminal. Following the Nuremberg trial, he was hanged for it. While writing these lines, Bush is doing exactly the same with Baghdad. Why should Bush not be hanged for his war crimes? Or Blair? Or will they be victorious in establishing a global Fourth Reich? Then there will be no Nuremberg type war crimes trials and Bush and Blair, who have committed the same war crimes, will escape the fate of the Nazi bosses.

We in Holland did not receive Hitler's troops with flags and flowers. We went underground to fight the Nazi invaders with everything we had. Nor did the Iraqis receive the US & UK hordes with cheers or jubilation. On the contrary, the US and UK occupiers will meet the same fate as the Israelis have experienced in the occupied territories in Palestine. Iraq will become an ideal new battleground for Islamic freedom fighters that will also further endanger the entire region of US Arab puppet regimes.

Hitler appointed a Reichs Komissar for Holland. In true Nazi tradition, Washington and London feel entitled as the conquerors of Baghdad to establish their own puppet regime. They have selected one of their own generals as governor-general. He will have to oversee a bunch of Quislings chosen from amongst Saddam's enemies. It's a classic recipe for more trouble to come. The global concept of the current US Administration could even amount to a prelude to World War III. Islamic guerrilla movements are, in this concept, the avant-garde for a collision between the world's religions and civilizations.

Richard Bernstein warned in *The New York Times* (March 24, 2003) that Bush's America intends to use its overwhelming military power 'to reshape the world, to chart a new political, economic, even psychological direction for many states and many millions of people, and to do so with much of the world looking on in skepticism and disapproval.' It's a fact, that following World War II, America was able to obtain astonishing

results in transforming some important aspects of the international order. With US assistance and encouragement former Axis powers, Japan, Germany and Italy rejoined the democratic family of nations. To some extent this happened in Russia after the collapse of communism.

However, US efforts to reshape Afro-Asian nations have proven to be quite a different matter. The founding in 1955 of the bloc of non-aligned nations in Bandung, Indonesia was a clear signal to the former imperialist world, that billions of people on this planet were not prepared to become fake Yankees.

Washington's efforts to reshape the world's largest Muslim nation, Indonesia by way of a fascist military coup in 1965 totally boomeranged. America's puppet, fascist general Suharto, crony of Paul Wolfowitz, turned out to be the most notorious mass killer in the history of Southeast Asia. Only to be later upstaged by Pol Pot in Cambodia. Bill Clinton brazenly called Suharto 'our boy.' Pol Pot and Suharto slaughtered millions of Asians between them. While Washington screamed murder (!) concerning Pol Pot, it observed total silence about its own Quisling Suharto. Therefore, those, who know their history, fully understand that the US applies double standards. The bloc of more than one hundred non-aligned nations, amongst them Iraq is fully aware of America's true face. The non-aligned nations unanimously oppose Bush's war against Baghdad.

Billions of people in the Third and Fourth Worlds know that they are considered in Washington and London as third and fourth-class citizens. They know, that 3.000 US casualties in New York apparently justified mobilizing the entire US-UK war machine to attack Afghanistan and Iraq, while other 'evil nations' are candidates to be next in line. To avenge the loss of American lives in Manhattan is therefore fully legitimate. Israel suffers from identical racial and *Übermensch* misconceptions. The life lost of one Israeli has to be immediately avenged by slaughtering dozens of Palestinian freedom fighters. And if women and children are caught in the crossfire, and torn apart as a result, well, too bad. Collateral damage, it is said, is unavoidable in any military conflict. Another argument Americans and Israelis repetitiously advance in their discussions is that Hitler gassed thousands of innocent Jews. As if, Palestinians are responsible for German war crimes. In our time, Palestinians are the victims of Sharon's war crimes supported and obviously fully underwritten by George Bush.

At least Bill Clinton spent weeks on end with Prime Minister Ehud Barak and PLO leader Yasser Arafat in order to find a suitable and peaceful solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Bush apparently gave Sharon the green light to live up to his reputation of butchering Palestinians at will. Madeleine Albright informed the press after Clinton had nominated her Secretary of State that she had never known she was a Jew until journalists told her that she came from a Jewish family. She nevertheless made a serious effort to find a solution for the conflict. Bush has been for 2,5 years president of the United-States and has never even bothered to meet, let alone to talk to Arafat. This president is a moron with a completely closed mind.

In his memoir published at the time he ran for president, he

stressed, that as an undergraduate at Yale, he and his friends always ignored visitors to the New-Haven campus, who came to talk to students, and who were critical of the of the war in Vietnam. (*A Charge to Keep: My journey to the White House*, Harper Collins, New York, 1999, pp. 50). This says it all. Junior likes to see life in black and white, right or wrong, good or evil. Friederich Nietzsche wrote in 1886 a treatise on the subject. This president never heard of Nietzsche. What would junior make of Nietzsche's observation that good and evil were not always distinguishable to the naked eye? (*Beyond Good and Evil*, Henry Regnery, Chicago, 1955).

Bush is a president, who knows virtually nothing, but keeps stressing how sure he is of himself and the righteousness of his fatal decisions. As David Brooks warned in the *Times* (March 7, 2003), 'The US is in the grip of a certainty crisis.' Brooks: 'The US press is filled with psychologizing. Two explanations have re-emerged. First, Bush is stupid. Intellectually incurious, he is unable to adapt to events. Secondly, he is a religious nut. He sees the world as a simple battle of good versus evil. His faith cannot admit shades of grey.'

What would the 43rd President of the United-States answer, when a journalist would read on a press conference the following sentence to him? Nietzsche: 'Even today there are still harmless self-observers who believe in 'immediadiate certainties', such as, 'I think' or, in the formulation of Schopenhauer's superstition, 'I will'.' Junior would not know what hit his brain and stammer an unintelligible reply. Brooks further wrote, 'Why does Bush seem so certain, decisive and sure of himself, when everybody knows that anxiety and anguish are the proper poses to adopt at such times?' Of course, he does, because this US president is an imbecile.

Was the handling of the Israeli-Palestinian crisis too much for him? Much in the same way as in his student days he preferred not to listen to arguments that opposed the war in Vietnam? Perhaps he does not want to consider the fact, that Hezbollah guerrillas in Lebanon have replaced their old Katyusha rockets with Fajr-3 and even Fajr-4 projectiles imported from Iran. These have a 70 kilometer range and could reach Haifa and even Tel Aviv. According to the Israeli Army the Hezbollah's have already imported 8.000 of these deadly rockets with the assistance of the mullah's in Teheran. Shipments went via Damascus. Writer Larry Collins reported in the *Herald Tribune*, that Sharon let it be known to president Bashar Assad, that Israel would hold Syria responsible in case the Fajr rockets were ever fired at Israel (March 12, 2003). Junior in DC leaves the handling of these dangerous matters entirely up to Sharon, the current rogue prime minister of Israel.

Whenever I hear Bush, blasting president Saddam for cruelty and the behavior of a war criminal, I recall attending Patrice Lumumba's last press conference in 1960 in Leopoldville, later Kinshasa. It was the US and Belgium who ordered the first freely elected Prime Minister of the nation to be hacked to pieces. Next, in true Nazi tradition, Washington appointed its own Reichs Kommissar, marshal Mobutu in charge of that mineral rich country. Mobutu had been trained in Israel, like Ge-

neral Suharto had attended US military schools. Both martial dictators were kept in power for 32 years through Washington's protection and good offices with billions of dollars and shiploads of armaments. In Chili, the freely elected president Salvador Allende was overthrown and killed in 1973 with Henry Kissinger's personal blessing. Washington, once again, instated a fascist general, Augusto Pinochet, who became another Washington Quisling specializing in terrorism against his own people.

All American presidents looked the other way, when these US protected war criminals were slaughtering their citizens and were building concentration camps to make their enemies disappear. Now, the world is told by Washington and London, that Iraq, too, is ruled by a monster. However, president Saddam Hussein's record of human rights violations pales in comparison with some of the mass murdering brutes purposely placed by the White House, the Pentagon and the CIA in dictatorial positions in the developing world. It should be realized by the PNAC'ers that little love remains for America shameful lies constantly repeated by Bush, Blair and other PNAC gangsters. Their present spokesmen at military headquarters in the Middle East illustrate the dictum, that lies and perfidy are the refuge of fools and cowards. Peter Preston forewarned in *The Guardian* (October 8, 2001) that Bush's callous War on Terrorism would end up becoming 'a festival of lies.' 'Truth is the first casualty of conflict. Military briefers will become wholly unreliable by design,' Preston cautioned. He could not have been more right. We now hear a US official declaring with a straight face, that the US did not target a Baghdad market, and that the monster Saddam must have targeted his own people with a missile.

Surely, the far majority of the western world and most people in non-aligned nations are fully aware of the dirty games being played by the White House and 10 Downing Street. The present London-Washington Axis is identical to the BerlinRome Nazi Axis. We are right; the rest of the rest of the world is wrong. The Nazis and the PNAC'ers both practiced the doctrine of pre-emptive military strikes. In doing so, they both dumped international peace organizations in order to wage their aggressive wars, and conquer the territory of others.

The reverberations of the Nazi go-it-alone policies led mankind in 1939 directly into World War II. The world community did not accept Hitler and Mussolini's pre-emptive strike strategies outside accepted international law and order. In 2003, the US and UK launched their first solo strike into the oil rich Mid-East in direct violation of UN rules. Fairytales about a 48nation coalition of the willing against Iraq are simply Joseph Goebbels tactics used by the current PNAC government in Washington. Bush and Blair are returning to 19th century colonialism and imperialism, to safeguard the delivery of energy to the Anglo-Saxon industrial engine for the next half century.

America alone is importing 60 per cent of its oil needs. That share is expected to grow to as much as to 90 per cent by 2020. The Bush II Administration is literally entwined with the global oil industry. In 2001 vice-president Dick Cheney unveiled a

national energy policy with emphasis on a greater diversity of oil supplies. Oil remains the key to the US economic colossus and its almighty dollar. The Nazis were en route towards the Caucasus to lay their hands on Soviet oil resources, but were thwarted in their strategy at Stalingrad. Will Baghdad indeed become Washington's Stalingrad on the way toward complete control of Arab oil reserves? The *Observer* (January 6, 2003) carried a headline, 'Scramble to carve up Iraqi oil reserves lies behind US diplomacy.' 'Operation Freedom', as Bush and Blair euphemistically call their sacred mission towards Baghdad is also a classic neo-imperialistic struggle between Anglo-American oil interests on the one hand, and Russian-French energy demands on the other.

Since his early days, the president's heart belongs to the oil industry. His own dabbling in black gold was a mild fiasco. Hence, his family bought him a baseball team. However, they also dangled into the venture capital business. Dad's friends, former Secretary of State James Baker, Dick Cheney, Frank Carlucci, Donald Rumsfeld, and even former British Prime Minister John Major, all joined the Carlyle Group. Its multibillion dollar funds grow fat on the back of global conflict. Jamie Doward wrote in *The Observer* (March 23, 2003) that Carlyle also built up the Saudi National Guard from 26.000 to 70.000 troops. Carlyle likewise purchased the United Defense Company. It developed the huge 40-tonne howitzer named the Crusader, which despite strong opposition from the US Army was commissioned by the Pentagon anyway. The guns cost 665 million dollars. The contract was signed two weeks after 09-11. Carlyle - meaning the Bush cronies - made 240 million dollars on the deal.

In the mean time, the rat race to sign lucrative Iraqi oil contracts, once Saddam has been defeated is in full swing. British Trade and Industry Secretary, Patricia Hewitt, has been pressing the White House for billions of dollars of oil industry and reconstruction contracts, because, after all, British soldiers are also dying in the Iraqi desert. Therefore, British companies should share in the after war profits. Richard Perle, driving force behind the PNAC and chairman of the Pentagon Advisory Board came first under sharp attack and was under investigation for cashing in 725.000 dollars for a job on behalf of telecommunications giant Global Crossing Fiber Optics. He also had dubious dealings with Hutchison Whampoa Ltd, controlled by Hong Kong billionaire Li Ka-shing and Singapore Technologies Telemedia Pte, another phone company controlled by the Singapore government. Perle was jumping the gun before everybody else. *The New York Times* published a disapproving editorial that Perle was trying to enrich himself by using his Pentagon office for private gain (March 25, 2003). Perle was forced to resign.

Halliburton, the Texas Company of which vice-president Dick Cheney used to be the boss, was awarded another Pentagon contract to put out fires on Iraqi oilfields. The Vice-President is still cashing in a million dollars yearly from his former company. Provided, of course, that he continues to use his White House power and influence to award them profitable

contracts.

Top future 'liberators' of Iraq were already figuring out how to up their private bank accounts and forge the most profitable deals after the Iraqi government was defeated. Bush was totally convinced that the march on Baghdad was going to be a cakewalk. The PNAC'ers had been deluding themselves, even more so after 09-11, that the Iraqi leader was indeed a monster, and undoubtedly was hated and despised by the Iraqi masses. Bush and Blair were convincing the US and UK public that their troops would be welcomed by cheering crowds. Bush told his White House staffers in February 2003 that he already considered Saddam Hussein 'irrelevant' because he would be soon destroyed.

British Defense Chief, Geoff Hoon, assured James Blitz of *The Financial Times* (March 1, 2003) that the invasion of Iraq would be 'very short.' The British planned a round-the-clock invasion to topple Saddam. President Bush said a few days later, 'The attack will be short and awesome.' Following a meeting with Donald Rumsfeld, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, general Richard Myers, and 'Wunderkind' Paul Wolfowitz, the president repeated, that the US and Britain envisaged 'a Blitzkrieg style onslaught against Saddam' lasting perhaps a week. (*The Independent*, March 6, 2003). Vice Prime Minister Tariq Aziz, a close collaborator of Saddam since the 50's, was sounding a serious warning to the contrary. No-one listened in Washington and London. I met him twice in 2002 in Baghdad, and became persuaded that he was a man to take very seriously.

A contingent of western writers, experts and journalists likewise contributed to raising false hopes and expectations for an expected short fast military campaign. Crazy was on the loose everywhere, especially in America. William Safire, columnist of *The New York Times* published an article, 'Let's finish off Saddam' (March 7, 2003). 'We are launching this attack, already too long delayed, primarily to defend ourselves,' Safire wrote, 'This is a response to reasonable fear... This campaign will make us safer, allaying our fears; it has the potential of making the world freer, justifying our hopes.' It was whacko talk, which had no relation to reality. Nevertheless, the claptrap was printed in America's most authoritative daily paper.

Bush, Safire and other believers in PNAC war aims were intentionally misleading the public by talking of an Iraqi threat to America. While North Korea openly declared that its nuclear missiles were ready to be fired, Bush and Blair were planning to destroy weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, which this country obviously did not possess. The UN inspectors declared in chorus that Baghdad had no nuclear arms and would not have them in a near future. Yet Bush and Blair rushed into an illegal criminal attack on another member of the United Nations, ignoring their international legal obligations and clearly lowering themselves to standard Nazi behaviour.

Charles Krauthammer, echoing the rubbish of Richard Perle, published a column in the *Washington Post* titled 'Ignore the UN.' Addressing himself to President Bush, he wrote, 'Don't go back, Mr. President. You walked away from the United Nations at great cost and with great courage. Don't go back.'

Krauthammer has also been for many years a prominent writer for *Time* and other publications. Nevertheless, the 09-11 events seem to have caused a widespread foolishness in the US, which prevents the Krauthammer's to function calmly and objectively. The first time I visited the UN in the old building at Lake Success was in 1949. I became accredited as a correspondent at the new East River skyscraper in 1957 and worked there through the mid seventies. If anyone recognizes the importance of the world organization as an international tool of diplomacy, it is I. It's therefore objectionable to see Bush and the PNAC'ers making incurable fools of themselves as they set about destroying the UN.

Dachau concentration camp specialist, Joshua Greene presented suggestions in *The New York Times* (March 21, 2003) about what Washington should do with Saddam after he was captured. Green's first and foremost advice was to follow the Nazi method, 'Shoot him.' This, he wrote, was hero General George Patton's way to deal with captured Nazi's. Line them up, tell them what they did, and pull the trigger. Advice number 2: Try Saddam before a Nuremberg type international court. Number 3: Turn him over to his own people. Number 4: Try him for a military tribunal. Reading these recommendations by a Dachau specialist 60 years after Hitler's extermination camps were liberated, made me think of a line from *Mein Kampf*, 'Hate is more lasting than dislike.'

Perhaps Joshua Greene should have given more thought to the question of how first to capture president Saddam and then philosophize about what to do with the prisoner. General Patton's manner of carrying out US justice did not differ too much from the way the Waffen SS operated. At the time of this writing, the 10th day of the US-UK 'liberation' campaign the entire world realizes that Bush, Rumsfeld and General Tommy Franks have been the victims of their own nutty fairy tales about Iraq. President Chirac, President Putin and Chancellor Schroeder of Germany made every effort to slow Washington down. They were promptly called cowards by the maniacal PNAC clique in Washington. Even serious members of Congress were demonstrating their silliness by ostentatiously pouring expensive bottles of French wines into sewers of the city's sidewalks.

Americans were quick to lambaste the French 'un-grateful traitors'. 'They would be speaking German had we not come to free them from Hitler,' was a standard televised complaint. Perhaps many Americans do sincerely assume that the invasion of Normandy in 1944 was carried out in a godlike spirit of true US altruism.

John Brown, a State Department career officer resigned after twenty years of service in protest over current US foreign policy. He warned, 'The 20th century was the American century, but is the 21st century becoming the anti-American century'. (*The Times*, March 15, 2003). The same day on the same page polls indicated that 67% of the British public, 86% of the Germans, 85% of the Italians, 75% of the Poles, 87% of the Russians, 93% of the Spaniards, 94% of the Turks, 84% of the Japanese were opposed to US-UK war plans against Iraq.

Why Bush and Blair did not honor the overwhelming majority opinion in the world is for historians and Bushologists to decide. It was to be expected that this man from Texas was behaving the way he did. He never gave a hoot about democracy to begin with. Had he been a fair political player, he would have offered Al Gore a re-run. But his family and their cronies in the PNAC and oil industry simply hijacked the 2000 democratic election with the clear aim of grabbing the White House and thus US hyper power in the world. Now they could ensure the import after 90 per cent of needed oil supplies by 2020.

Daniel Henniger choose to ridicule the French and the Germans in *The Wall Street Journal* (February 17, 2003) because they were warning the Bush Administration in the Security Council not to walk open eyed into a prearranged Saddam Hussein prepared guerrilla war. By embarking on this war, Bush and Blair gained from day one an entirely unintended disastrous result. They succeeded in raising Saddam's standing to near mythological heights. The much maligned evil tyrant suddenly became a heroic figure in the entire Muslim world. In Indonesia hundreds of thousands demonstrated carrying placards, 'Bush global terrorist.' All over the Arab world, including Iran, fatwa's were proclaimed prohibiting cooperation with US and UK forces. Religious decrees like these made it impossible for Shias in southern Iraq to revolt against Baghdad. Bush and Blair were misled by Iraqi dissidents. They were ignorant of Iraqi realities and became the victims of their own misguided propaganda.

France, Germany and Russia had gathered accurate information. That's why they endeavored to delay the Bush-Blair rush to battle. The *Wall Street Journal*, as usual reflecting the attitudes the US business world, including the PNAC, printed Henniger's report trying to portray the French and the German's as fools. He wrote, 'In recent weeks, what had been a difficult but manageable relationship between US European policy elites was driven into the streets,' referring to large scale European demonstrations against the war. Henniger added, 'Inevitably, the quality of the US-European debate becomes: 'Bomb Texas, they have oil too'.' (*Wall Street Journal*, February 17, 2003).

What the White House, the PNAC and Wall Street seem unable to understand is that Europe, after two devastating World Wars with an estimated 50 million dead, have sharply different views on conflicts as compared to the Bush's, Cheney's, Roomfeld's, Wolfowitz's and ostensibly the Blair's and Straw's. As Hala Jaber reported in *The Sunday Times* (March 30, 2003), 'Honour is Iraq's Secret Weapon.' Why were allied troops not received with open arms and flowers?

For Iraqis and Arabs, whether they are for or against Saddam, the US-UK invasion desecrates Arab honor and dignity. 'This is an unforgivable sin in Iraqi culture. Nation and territory are as sacred as the honour of women, and occupation is as vile, shameful and abominable as rape,' Jabber wrote. These are values for which Muslims are all too ready to sacrifice their lives. These are for Muslims vitally important religious imperatives. For White House or Wall Street environments, the Islamic honor code is seen as Eastern pathology. How to counter this madness other than by raining cruise missiles on them?

On the 11th day of the invasion the first Iraqi suicide bombing killed four American Marines. The first Iraqi martyr was a young Army officer. Many more will follow him. America, by militarily intervening in the Arab world, unwittingly entered a second Vietnam type guerrilla war. It's a conflict that cannot be won. Vietcong guerrillas, clad in black pyjamas finally entered the US embassy in Saigon. It had taken them 15 years to do it, and Americans had to flee by helicopter from the rooftop. Bush says, that the US will take the time it needs, to conquer Iraq and defeat Saddam Hussein. The question is: Will Iraqis not likewise take their time to chase the invaders from their sacred homeland?